

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1882.

The Week.

THE *Herald* has published a facsimile of one of the disgraceful circulars issued by the Republican Congressional Committee to the officers of the Government, calling on them for blackmail in the guise of assessments for campaign purposes. This particular circular actually demands fifteen dollars from a day laborer with a wife and children to support, his wages being two dollars a day; and the *Herald* mentions another case in which three dollars and fifty cents are demanded from an errand-boy aged thirteen. It would be impossible to find in the records of any corrupt monarchy of the eighteenth century a trace of a proceeding so paltry and degrading on the part of persons holding a high, or indeed any, position connected with the Government. The members of Congress who have allowed their names to be put to this circular ought indeed, as the *Herald* says, to be ashamed of themselves, personally as well as officially. There are some things to which an honorable man ought not to stoop to procure money for any object, however sacred or respectable, whether church or party; and extorting small sums of money from poor men by leading them to think their livelihood will be imperilled by their refusal, is one of them. It is, apart altogether from any consideration of its bearing on the purity or efficiency of the public service, a most discreditable business, with which some at least, we feel sure, of the members of the Congressional Committee would not have allowed their names to be connected if they had given the matter any serious attention.

The Boston *Advertiser*, apropos of the same matter, asks very pertinently who authorizes this Congressional Committee to make itself the instrument of this extortion. The Republican National and State Committees are appointed by the party conventions, and are therefore empowered by the party to act in its name and on its behalf in doing whatever needs or ought to be done for the proper conduct of the party canvasses. If the party has a right to levy assessments on the salaries of Government officials for its own purposes, it is through these Committees alone that the extortion should be practised. It is they and they only who speak with the party voice, and hold out the party hat. The Congressional Committee is, on the other hand, a volunteer organization. It creates itself. It is in no sense a representative body. All the authority it possesses is what it possesses in its own right. Toward the campaign fund its members have an inherent right to contribute out of their pockets, each for himself, and to solicit others to contribute as a personal favor to them. But they have no right to demand money from the clerks on behalf of the party, and to enforce the demand with an intimation that it is viewed with favor in high "official quarters"; and still less to fix the amount which each victim

should give. In fact, even from the spoilsman's point of view, their performance is a gross piece of usurpation, besides being, from the reformer's point of view, an invitation to commit a misdemeanor.

Government employees can put an end to this usurpation by simply taking no notice of the circular. In complying with its demands, they will not only certainly violate the United States statute, but encourage the formation of volunteer bands of what are called in city politics "strikers," for the purpose of extracting money from them of which no public account is ever rendered. To this last point in particular we beg to direct the attention of all concerned. There is no better way of promoting corruption and fraud than giving money to people in trust without exacting any account from them of the way they spend it. No body of men in the world has virtue enough to withstand temptation of this kind for any great length of time, and volunteer political committees are no exception to the rule. In fact, the inability of all political committees to resist it was plainly intimated by the late President Garfield when he said—

"I ask these gentlemen what they think of the system of political assessments, . . . of issuing a circular calling for one, two, or three per cent. of the salaries of all the employees, . . . with the distinct understanding that unless they pay, others will be found to fill their places? I call the attention of gentlemen around me to that shameful fact. The practice affords a large so-called electioneering fund which in many cases never gets beyond the shysters and the mere camp-followers of the party."

The proper business of Congressmen is, in short, legislation and stump-speaking. The raising of money from clerks to carry their own elections had better be left to others, if it is to be tolerated at all.

Mr. Jay Hubbell, the Chairman of the Congressional Committee which is engaged in extorting money from poor men in the Government service (and who, by the way, is the same Hubbell who tried to obtain from General Garfield in the last Presidential campaign a direct request to Brady and the Star-route men to contribute handsomely to the campaign fund), has written a letter in answer to the circular of the Civil-Service Reform Association to the officeholders, recently published. He is naturally annoyed by this interference with his operations. Nobody was probably ever yet engaged in getting small sums of money out of poor men, widows, and children by threats, who did not object to the meddling of the bystanders and want them to mind their own business. He challenges Mr. G. W. Curtis, as the President of the Association, to unite with him in requesting the President to ask the opinion of the Attorney-General on the legality of the payments which he is engaged in extorting. He thinks this would be "both more manly and more honorable" than "an attempt to confuse the action or alarm the minds" of his victims. This is decidedly what Mr. Squeers called "richness." The appeal for more manliness and honor from a person engaged in what is essentially black-

mail is not bad in itself; but the calling encouragement to the poor people whom he is stripping of their hard earnings at the beginning of the hot weather, with wives and children who need a breath of country air, to hold on to their money, "confusing their action and alarming their minds," is richer still. The course he suggests, however, has already been adopted. The Civil-Service Reform Association has called the attention of the Attorney-General to his performances, and asked him, if he considers their view of the law (which they support with authorities) well grounded, to confuse Mr. Hubbell's action and alarm his mind by proper instructions to the District Attorneys.

Mr. Curtis has answered by a short and severe but much-needed lecture on the honorableness and morality of getting money from poor clerks, laborers, errand-boys, and even women, by a thinly-disguised threat that their means of livelihood will be endangered if they do not pay, and of using for the extortion a self-constituted body which renders no account of the disposition it makes of the funds thus acquired. This lecture will do Mr. Hubbell more good, though it may at first daze him more, than the answer of Messrs. Wheeler and Whitridge, the Civil-Service Reform Association's counsel, for we do not believe that he feels half as strong as a moralist as he does as a lawyer. He must have been conscious when he wrote to Mr. Curtis about honorableness and manliness that he was thereby exposing himself to numerous and unknown perils. A collector of campaign assessments from poor clerks, he must have felt, cannot safely "knock round" as a professor of ethics, and give hints on duty to anybody he happens to meet. He should be sure he knows his man before opening his ethical mouth. There are doubtless many in the Hubbell "crowd" to whom even he can profitably give lessons in social morality, but he ought to confine his instructions to them.

As the assessment circular of the Congressional Committee has been sent into the Navy-yards, and is, we believe, even reaching the laborers for the first time in the history of political corruption, we beg to call the attention of commanding officers and all others whom it may concern to Section 1546 of the United States Revised Statutes:

SEC. 1546. No officer or employee of the Government shall require or request any workman in any Navy-yard to contribute or pay any money for political purposes, nor shall any workman be removed or discharged for political opinion; and any officer or employee of the Government who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be dismissed from the service of the United States."

The New York banks further augmented their reserve during the week, so that they hold over \$9,000,000 lawful money more than is required. This gain was made notwithstanding that the Treasury took in much more money than it paid out. The foreign exchanges ruled against gold exports, but about \$1,400,000 was shipped at a loss, for the account, it

was said, of the Italian Government. The serious turn which Egyptian affairs have taken influenced the foreign financial markets, and British Consols declined during the week from 100 $\frac{1}{2}$ @ $\frac{1}{4}$ to 99 $\frac{1}{2}$ @ $\frac{1}{4}$, on the theory that such complications may result as to lead to a war in which the leading European nations will become involved. The weather throughout the country has been very favorable for the crops, and every interest which depends on the harvests has consequently improved. No important progress toward a settlement of the labor troubles has been made; the strike of the freight-handlers at the railroad stations in this and neighboring cities has caused heavy losses to business men. The railroad managers speak lightly of the matter. All the freight which is delayed until July 1 will go forward under the new schedule of advanced rates, so that however much the business public may lose, the railroads are likely to be gainers even if they grant the demands of the strikers. At the Stock Exchange the tendency of prices was upward, the favorable outlook for the crops more than offsetting other unfavorable considerations.

The bill extending the national-bank charters has passed the Senate, after a somewhat interesting discussion on the silver question, in which Mr. Sherman and Mr. Allison, of Iowa, took part. Mr. Sherman advocated a double standard, but insisted that silver should pass at its market value in gold, which is in fact the only way in which the bimetallic theory can be put in practice, and, we may add, ever has been put in practice. Mr. Allison, on the other hand, believes that the two metals can be made to circulate on equal terms if the Powers will all come to an agreement on the subject, and accounts for the failure of the late attempt to get them to come to an agreement by saying that they were not energetic enough. It is, of course, impossible to refute those who hold that silver and gold can be kept at equal value by international treaty, because the proposition is in the nature of prophecy, and prophecy cannot be refuted. The only way to meet a prophet in discussion is not to believe him. It is certain, however, that the probability of international agreement is now remote, and that in the meantime we must do something to deal with our share of the problem, and whatever is done ought to be done quickly. We are at present neither prepared to act alone, nor to wait for concert of action on the part of other nations.

The trouble which was sure to come from the bill restricting Chinese immigration has already begun to show itself in the protest sent by the Chinese Government to Washington. The objections urged against the bill are the length of the time during which it is to remain in effect—ten years—and the fact that it makes no distinction between skilled and unskilled laborers. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his instructions issued to Collectors of Customs to carry into effect the provisions of the bill, directs particular attention to the fact that by the term "laborer" is meant skilled as well as unskilled laborer. This, the Chinese Government points out, will interfere with the business of Chinese merchants and manu-

facturers now resident in the United States, and may in some cases actually break it up. Besides this, there are now some sixty thousand Chinese laborers employed in the West Indies, whose contracts expire next year, and who, if they cannot be allowed transit across the United States, will have to go home by way of England, which of course would entail upon them a heavy additional expense. In reply to all this, our Government had practically nothing to say, except that it will refer the matter to Congress, which will probably do nothing at this late day of the session. Of course the popular anti-American feeling excited in China is very intense. Recent despatches from San Francisco give an idea of the stories which are set afloat to inflame it by referring to the "irritation" produced by the publication of a letter, "attributed to Commodore Shufeldt," in which the Empress is accused of "criminality." Under ordinary circumstances, if Commodore Shufeldt had been doing anything of the kind, our Government might be called upon to discipline him, but it would not affect the friendly relations between the two countries. Now, however, it is proposed, or said to be proposed, that "China's assistance in the Korean negotiations" should be summarily withdrawn.

The worst of the matter is that, so far as the Chinese Bill is concerned, the Chinese are right. The bill was passed without any proper inquiry as to how it would affect existing contracts, and this, too, by a country which has a clause in its Constitution preventing the passage of laws by the States impairing contract obligations. Its provisions were subject to an existing treaty relating to a very delicate subject, the right of emigration; and as its progress through Congress was watched with the closest attention by the Chinese Government, there was something very hasty and outrageous in passing the bill without waiting for some expression from China, which was certain to come sooner or later, and did come three weeks after its passage. Now the matter will have to be called to the attention of Congress again, and that body will either refuse to reconsider it, which will be a flagrant act of discourtesy to China, or have to take it all up again and settle the "Chinese question" *de novo*.

The news of Secretary Teller's visit to the Indian school at Carlisle, and of the warm approval he expressed of the methods, as well as the results, of the instruction administered there to Indian children, has gone far to relieve the friends of the Indians of the somewhat hasty apprehension that the new Secretary would treat this class of Indian training-schools with disfavor. We have no doubt it will also turn out that the Secretary has been misunderstood by those who ascribed to him opinions unfavorable to the settlement of Indians in severalty. He may, quite reasonably, consider one Indian tribe less fitted than another for a step so little in accord with their traditional habits, but we are confident that Secretary Teller will not reject the severalty plan whenever an Indian tribe or individual Indians are willing to accept it. The Secretary

holds that the gradual dissolution of the tribal relation is a prerequisite to the placing of the Indian upon an equal legal footing with other inhabitants of the country, and it is evident that their settlement in severalty is a prerequisite to the dissolution of tribal relations. The holding of lands in common by Indian tribes is one of the strongest bonds of their tribal cohesion.

There is a refreshing piece of news from the Mescalero Indian Agency in New Mexico. It appears that a band of Apache marauders, after a plundering raid, had taken refuge with a subordinate chief on the Mescalero reservation. The Indian Agent, Mr. Llewellyn, gathered his Indian police force and some friendly chiefs besides, attacked the camp of the marauders, and routed them after a lively fight, in which several of the hostiles were killed, and the Agent himself was shot through the left arm. The Agent presents this as proof of the determination of the Mescaleros to keep order on the reservation. The Indian police, which has frequently been attacked in Congress as a useless institution, has on this occasion once more demonstrated that now and then it can do the service of the Army, especially when the Agent is a courageous and active man. Mr. Llewellyn was formerly in the service of the Department of Justice as a deputy-marshal or detective, and he is said to have done excellent service on the Northwestern frontier in breaking up bands of mail robbers and "road agents," now and then taking a desperate character with his own hands, at the risk of his life.

The dilatoriness and general lack of system in making up, debating, and passing the appropriation bills in the two Houses of Congress has received another striking illustration. Here we are at the very close of the fiscal year, when all the appropriations made at the last session expire, and when the Government will come to a standstill unless sufficient appropriations are made at this session, to take effect on the first of July; and yet several of the most important bills have not even been reported to the Senate, and some of them will be subjected to long, if not thorough, debate before they can go through. To bridge over the period between the end of the present fiscal year and the time when the new appropriations can go into force, Congress will have to resort to the expedient of extending the appropriations of last year for the time being, so that the needs of the Government may be at least temporarily provided for. But this shows again the inconveniences arising from a lack of organic correspondence between Congress and the Executive branch of the Government. If the Executive were authorized or directed to submit to Congress at each session a complete and well-digested budget, the Appropriation Committees would find their work greatly facilitated, and they would be able to make their reports much earlier in the session. And if the two houses then adhered to the rule giving the appropriation bills precedence before other business, such cases as the present would never arise, and Congress

would be at liberty to adjourn the long session much earlier than it does now, and with the public business much better done.

The Chilian Congress was convened on the 1st of this month, and, according to the latest advices from Panama, it is expected to pass a bill for incorporating Arica, Tacna, and Tarapaca with Chili. Novoa, the Chilian Commissioner in Lima, with whom Mr. Trescott carried on his late abortive negotiations, has made a speech, in which he announces that the "spectre of intervention" has disappeared; and that Chili will settle the terms of peace herself. The Peruvians must by this time have abandoned all hope of active interference by the United States, and as the country is practically without any government, and dependent on the Chilian soldiers for the performance of ordinary police duty, it will have to be content with whatever is decided upon by its conquerors. Novoa's announcement that whatever government is "selected" will at once be "recognized," throws a flood of light on the condition of affairs.

President Santa Maria, in his message to the Chilian Congress, refers to our attempts to bring about peace, in terms which are barely civil. He says that Chili accepted our officious services, but this was on receiving an assurance from the American Envoy that no "intention of interference was entertained," and that we only desired to bring "a friendly and officious influence to bear on the question." President Santa Maria is, however, not willing to let us off even with this disavowal. He says interference from any quarter would not only "have been a violation of the eternal principles of international law and justice, but would call forth from all America a protest against the dangers inherent to such an act." Continuing in the same strain, he declares that such interference would have had no effect, and adds, maliciously, that "mediation, in order to be efficacious and beneficial, must be in answer to an invitation proceeding from the belligerents themselves." Of the great Blaine Pan-American Congress he makes no mention whatever, which seems ill-bred, considering that Mr. Blaine had very handsomely offered to pay the hire of the hall in which the meetings were to be held. In fact, it is plain that things in South America are not yet ripe for an American protectorate, although they may be when we have no social or political problems to occupy us at home, and are ready to give our whole minds to the reform of Spanish America.

The Bishop of Melbourne (Australia) has refused to accede to the request of some of his flock to direct a prayer for rain to be used in his diocese, on the plain ground that material phenomena are under the control of law, which will not be changed or interrupted in answer to prayer, and that prayer should be confined to spiritual blessings. We believe this is the first formal recognition by a clergyman of prominence of the soundness of the scientific view of the material universe. A prayer for improvement in the condition of Ireland has been ordered in the English

churches by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at least in his own province, which—apropos of the Bishop of Melbourne's action—leads a correspondent of the London *Times* to call attention to the fact that this Irish prayer is to be used between two other prayers in the liturgy—one for the High Court of Parliament, and one for All Conditions of Men, either of which, if effectual, makes the Irish prayer wholly unnecessary, even if it were not objectionable on other grounds, one of which is that it contains unnecessary information about the state of Ireland. He suggests, therefore, that the same end can be attained by simply directing inwardly the thoughts to Ireland when praying for wisdom for the rulers and unity among the ruled. Somewhat the same question came up here during Andrew Johnson's impeachment. Some of the friends of impeachment urged, through the press, that prayers for a verdict of guilty on at least one count should be offered up all over the country, to which it was well objected that the proper prayer for the crisis was that wisdom should be given to the Senate to do justice. There is such a thing as surplusage in prayer.

There has been a great deal of droll as well as horrible news from Ireland during the last year or two, but the news that a number of "Irish noblemen and gentlemen" have formed a joint-stock company for the purpose of counteracting the schemes of the Land League, and occupying and working the farms of evicted tenants, and, we presume, buying up tenants' goods sold at auction for non-payment of rent, is undoubtedly the drollest of any. They are, it is said, offering the shares as a desirable investment. This is a reproduction in modern shape of a process which has been more than once performed on Irish land. A "Company of Adventurers" was formed in England during the Commonwealth, for the purpose of speculating in Irish farms, from which the occupants were to be ejected, and if obstreperous killed, and it had a fair amount of success for those times. But the present proposal looks rather to the production of the state of things which would have been witnessed in France if the Duke of Brunswick's army had succeeded in restoring the King's authority, and putting the seigneurs back in their châteaux. The Irish Company can only succeed by getting its agents guarded constantly by troops and police, or, in other words, can only succeed in a state of war. That commercial men should be invited to take stock in what is in reality a filibustering enterprise, is certainly highly humorous, considering how many tempting fields of speculation are now open to capitalists.

The highly-pacific rôle played by the British fleet at Alexandria, while British subjects were being murdered on shore, seems to have been more than even the most peace-loving Liberals could bear. The wound to national pride, too, has been deepened by a panic in "Egyptians" on the Stock Exchange, and the bondholder is lifting up his voice, and when he is angry he is a great force in politics. Moreover, Egypt is drifting rapidly into complete anarchy, which raises the question of the safety of the Suez Canal. If this has to be

guarded by patrols either on land or water, as now appears to be the case, it would be clearly cheapest and safest in the long run, to strike at the root of the trouble by setting up a Government in Cairo competent to maintain order. That Arabi's Government is not capable of doing so is plain enough. The difficulty in dealing with him or his force hitherto, apart from the question of agreement between the Powers, has lain in the fact that the large body of Europeans in the country would be exposed to massacre on the first sign of armed intervention, and Arabi is playing on this fear in order to prevent intervention. But the Europeans are getting out of the country very rapidly, and a very small force will be sufficient to disperse or bring to reason the Egyptian Army. Arabi's performances furnish a new and striking illustration of the tendency of Egypt to fall under the rule of the Army, unless the Prince is a man of the strongest type, like Mehemet Ali and his son Ibrahim. What Arabi and his colonels are trying to set up is really a reproduction of the Mameluke régime, and the temptation to this is constant and peculiarly great, owing to the unequalled industry and patience of the fellahen and the wonderful fertility of the soil. Military despotism exhausts most other countries rapidly. It has ruined Asia Minor, but the Egyptian peasant always seems to be saying to the man with the sabre: "Be as turbulent, ruffianly, and wasteful as you please; I am sure to have the taxes ready, and the corn, and the wine, and the oil."

Matters are rapidly hurrying on in Egypt to war between Arabi and England, at least, and perhaps both England and France. Troops are being despatched from Malta, Gibraltar, England, and even, it is said, from India; and Sir Evelyn Wood, who distinguished himself in the Zulu campaign, is to take the command of any force that may be landed. In the meantime, Europeans are flying rapidly from the country, the resident consuls are in despair, and Arabi is growing more saucy and warlike, and it is believed will fight. He now declines to continue any attempts to discover and punish the perpetrators of the late massacre, and there is talk of his making some kind of demonstration against the Canal. Unless all the ordinary indications as to the value of troops are at fault, his army is worthless, and will be speedily dispersed by any European force sent against it, but no force can at once prevent pillage and assassination, and there is a fair chance of a renewal of disorders in Alexandria and Cairo. Arabi declares that if he is driven to the wall, he will show by documents that he has been egged on by the Sultan, which is not at all unlikely. The Conference continues to sit and deliberate at Constantinople, but no one knows what conclusion it has reached. The British Envoy is probably demanding European authorization for active operations in Egypt, and the Porte is protesting vigorously that no Conference is needed. In the meantime, the first notes of dissatisfaction with England begin to be heard in the Paris press; and, in fact, the political sky is once more clouded over as it has not been since the last Conference, which preceded the Russo-Turkish war, broke up its sittings.

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

(WEDNESDAY, June 21, to TUESDAY, June 27, 1882, inclusive.)

DOMESTIC.

CONGRESSMAN HUBBELL, Chairman of the Republican Congressional Committee, sent a letter to Mr. George William Curtis in reply to the Civil-Service Reform Association's circular warning Government employees against paying political assessments, in which he says he is willing to meet Mr. Curtis on the question anywhere and at any time, and to unite with him in requesting the President to ask an opinion of the Attorney-General; and, "if you desire any other form of action in any tribunal which can give an immediate consideration of the point, I will join you in testing the soundness of the circular." Mr. Hubbell concludes by saying: "The law is misstated in your circular, and the alarm which you seek to create is without justification in the law"; that he "disclaims to seek shelter behind any cover," and challenges Mr. Curtis to a contest on the question. Messrs. Wheeler and Whitridge, counsel for the Civil-Service Reform Association, at once replied, saying that it would give the Association much satisfaction to have an immediate opportunity of testing the soundness of the circular, and suggesting the United States Circuit Court for the Southern District of New York, which is now in session, as a good place to bring a test case "of any one which you may select of the numerous payments which have been made to you in the district in response to your circular." In regard to asking the opinion of the Attorney-General, Messrs. Whitridge and Wheeler reply that they do not accept the proposition, since it is the official duty of the Attorney-General, upon the reasonable complaint of respectable citizens, to present that complaint in legal form to the court for its decision. "We have no right to ask his opinion. We have a right to ask his official action." Mr. Curtis has also written a reply to Mr. Hubbell, in which he exposes the silliness of the allegations contained in his letter in the sentence, "I invite you to this mode of settlement as both more manly and more honorable than your attempt to confuse the action or alarm the minds of the employees alluded to."

A meeting of the Republican State Convention of Pennsylvania was held at Harrisburg on Wednesday to complete the ticket by the nomination of a Congressman-at-large in the place of Mr. Marshall, who declined the nomination. Marriott Brosius was nominated by a unanimous vote. A resolution was adopted recommending "the Republican State Committee to adopt all honorable means to harmonize the Republican party," but there seems to be less chance than ever of harmony in the party; meanwhile, the Independents are said to be gaining strength daily.

The Vermont Republican State Convention met on Wednesday and nominated John L. Barstow for Governor. The platform tenders to President Arthur assurances of confidence in his Administration; deprecates the "one-term practice which generally prevails in the election of members of the Legislature," and earnestly recommends the voters of the State to choose good men, "and by successive elections retain them in the legislative service as long as may be compatible with the public good"; favors "such additional legislation as the condition and wants of the common schools of the State may require"; and expresses confidence in the present system of taxation. It is a well-known fact that the one-term practice complained of has sprung up since biennial sessions were adopted.

The Maine Democratic State Convention met on Tuesday, and renominated Plaisted for Governor. The platform denounces the purchase of votes by corporations and capitalists, and assessments upon the salaries of Government officers; calls for a reform of the civil service and the tariff; denounces bank notes, and favors the abolition of imprisonment for debt.

The California Democratic State Convention nominated General George Stoneman, of Los Angeles, for Governor on Friday, after balloting for several days. John Daggett was nominated for Lieutenant-Governor, and J. R. Glasscock and C. A. Sumner for Congressmen-at-large. The platform applauds the movements of the workingmen of the East, notably of Pennsylvania, in opposition to moneyed corporations, and to the "monopolists of the Chinese trade."

The Readjuster Democrats of Tennessee held a Convention on Thursday, and nominated General W. D. Bate for Governor. The platform declares the recent settlement of the State debt unwise, because it is not in accord with the views of the people. It also declares that there is a portion of the State debt, known as the State debt proper, with accrued interest, the validity of which has never been disputed by any portion of the party. "We consider it," the platform says, "a valid and sacred obligation of the State, and favor the payment of the same in full; and we tender to our creditors a settlement of the remainder of the State debt by paying one-half the principal and accrued interest by issuing the bonds of the State, bearing interest at the rate of three per cent. per annum." Upon the adoption of this platform the State-Credit Democrats withdrew from the Convention, and decided to call a Convention for July 11, to nominate another candidate for Governor.

At a Cabinet meeting held on Friday night, at which the President submitted the question of the advisability of interfering with Guiteau's sentence, it was decided not to grant a respite. The Attorney-General, to whom all the appeals and petitions presented to the President bearing on the case had been referred, submitted an elaborate report to the Cabinet, reviewing all the points presented in favor of a respite, and recommending that it be not granted, on the ground that the sanity of the prisoner had been fully established at the trial. This report was unanimously approved by the members of the Cabinet, all of whom were present. Guiteau received the news cheerfully, and repeated that he was "God's man, and in God's hands," and that he would die for his inspiration, feeling that God would justify him in the other world.

At a Cabinet meeting on Friday, Secretary Folger reported that 60,000 Chinese laborers, now under contract in Cuba, and desirous of returning to China, have applied for permission to pass through the United States. The question was discussed, and the conclusion reached that under the provisions of the recent Chinese Bill, the permission could not be granted. This forces the Chinese to go home by way of England.

The Navy Department has received advices from Engineer Melville, dated Lena Delta, March 25, in which he gives a detailed account of his operations up to that date, and full particulars of the finding of the remains of De Long and his comrades. De Long's note-book was found beside him. The notes made therein were begun on Saturday, October 1, 1881, and the last entry is dated Sunday, October 30. The record is most pitiful reading, but shows that, under the circumstances, nothing could have been done by Melville, or any one else, to help De Long's company. The last man must have died within a few hours after the last entry was made in the diary, and no relief party which Engineer Melville could have organized could have got to them in time to find any of them alive.

Engineer Melville telegraphs from Yakutsk, under date of April 10, that he has searched in vain for any trace of the second cutter or Lieutenant Chipp's party. He has buried the remains of De Long's party and has secured every paper pertaining to the expedition. He is now on his way to Irkutsk.

Lieutenant Danenhower had an interview with the Secretary of the Navy on Saturday with reference to having the remains of the

Jeannette crew, found in Siberia, transported to this country for interment. The Secretary has referred the matter to a special committee to report upon the expediency of applying to Congress for assistance in the matter.

According to a special bulletin published by the Census Bureau, the number of males of voting age in the United States in 1880 was 12,830,349, of whom 1,487,344 were colored (blacks, Indians, Chinese, and Japanese). Other bulletins give the number of native-born and foreign residents in the United States, from which it appears that a very small proportion of the inhabitants of the Southern States are foreign-born in comparison with the proportion in any other part of the country. In the four States of Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee the percentage of foreign-born is only seven-tenths of one per cent.

The National Board of Health has elected the following officers for the ensuing year: President, Dr. J. L. Cabell, of Virginia; Vice-President, Dr. Stephen Smith, of New York; Secretaries, Dr. Thomas J. Turner and Mr. S. F. Phillips. Dr. J. S. Billings and Dr. P. H. Bailhache were elected to serve on the Executive Committee.

A caucus of the Democratic members of the House of Representatives was held on Thursday night, at which it was decided to vote against Mr. Kelley's Revenue Bill, unless certain amendments thereto were adopted. It was also decided, in case the proposed amendments were rejected, to offer a motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report a bill abolishing all internal-revenue taxes except those upon whiskey and whiskey-dealers. The bill was passed on Tuesday by a vote of 127 to 80.

The Senate passed the bill enabling national banks to extend their corporate existence, by a vote of 34 to 13, on Thursday. The bill has undergone considerable modification since it came from the House, and three sections, embodying the Sherman three per cent. funding scheme, Mr. Beck's provision punishing the over-certification of checks, and Mr. Allison's gold-certificate proposition, have been added to it.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs has prepared a bill providing for a complete judicial system in China, Japan, and other countries, where the United States by treaty, custom, or otherwise, exercises jurisdiction over its citizens.

A number of the leading Republican members of the House held a conference on Friday to consider the question of adjournment *sine die*. It was decided that the business of the House could be disposed of by the 10th of July, and that there would be no necessity for Congress to remain in session beyond July 15 at the latest.

The strike of the freight-handlers in New York and Jersey City continues. This strike has caused great loss to merchants, especially to those dealing in perishable goods. A number of mercantile firms of New York have signed an address to the general traffic managers of the railroads for the purpose of impressing upon them the necessity "of some action being taken to solve the present difficulty as speedily as possible." On Saturday the situation became serious, as the strikers began to interfere with men who continued to work. A large force of well-armed police was put on duty in Jersey City, and active preparations were made to put down a riot. On Monday, Governor Ludlow, of New Jersey, issued a proclamation calling upon the local authorities to use their power to prevent any disturbances, and adding that the military power of the State would be promptly used to aid the local authorities in their efforts to preserve the public peace and protect property.

Another storm of wind and rain passed over Iowa on Thursday. The damage to property

was very great, and several deaths are reported. On Friday, a tidal wave swept the lake front of Cleveland, Ohio, inflicting damage to property roughly estimated at \$30,000.

During a heavy thunderstorm on Thursday at Columbia, S. C., the Confederate monument in the State House grounds was struck by lightning, and the marble statue of a Confederate soldier, which surmounted it, was thrown down and shattered into fragments.

The report of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy at Annapolis states that many of the buildings are unsafe, and liable to fall at any time.

Michael Davitt has been addressing large and enthusiastic meetings on the Irish question, in Boston, Philadelphia, New Haven, and other places during the week.

Edmund Benjamin, the coxswain of the Columbia College crew, was drowned while bathing at New London on Friday, and the Harvard-Columbia race, which was to have taken place on Saturday, has been postponed until July 3.

FOREIGN.

The programme of the new Egyptian Ministry includes the maintenance of the new *status quo* and the fulfilment of international obligations. On Friday the London *Standard's* Alexandria correspondent telegraphed that he was informed on the best authority that if France and England interfere actively in Egyptian affairs, Arabi Pasha will blow up the Suez Canal and the railway to Cairo, and oppose the landing of European troops in Alexandria. If beaten, he will retire to the desert, where he is promised the support of 30,000 Bedouins. The Egyptian Ministry, the despatch adds, are prepared to sanction the above policy on patriotic grounds. Dervish Pasha received a telegram from the Sultan instructing him to use his efforts to induce Arabi Pasha to go to Constantinople before the sitting of the European Conference, and stating that the Sultan is satisfied with Arabi's attitude. It is understood that Arabi replied to the invitation to Constantinople by saying that he was willing to go, but that the Army would not let him. Arabi is reported to have said that he would resist to the death every pretence on the part of the enemies of Egypt to interfere with her affairs, and that he cannot regard any settlement as satisfactory until the fleets have withdrawn. The report that he aimed at ruling Egypt without the Khedive he declared to be a base calumny. On Saturday the news came that the exodus of Europeans had begun again, owing to rumors of fresh disturbances. Admiral Seymour, the British commander, says that he can only land 1,000 men in case of a rising. The Khedive has written a letter to Ragheb Pasha, President of the Council, recapitulating the recent events in Egypt, which he describes as deplorable. He points out that foreigners continue to leave Egypt, that commercial affairs are at a standstill, that specie is being hastily withdrawn, that there is a complete absence of credit, and that enormous loss is thus caused to the country. He declares that a strict, searching inquiry must be held to find out the causes which led to the catastrophe in Alexandria, and that it is absolutely necessary that measures be taken for the reestablishment of friendly relations between the natives and Europeans for the maintenance of order and the resumption of business, on which the prosperity of the country depends. The *Standard's* correspondent at Alexandria considers the Khedive's present position very alarming, and thinks he will be arrested on the first sign of foreign occupation.

On Tuesday it was announced that the British Vice-Consul at Alexandria had resigned. Arabi Pasha has declared that the natives implicated in the massacre at Alexandria on June 11 shall not be punished unless the Europeans who fired on the rioters are also punished.

The Conference of the Powers at Constantinople has been in session. The first sitting lasted several hours. The only differences revealed were with reference to the contingency of a military occupation and to the financial control. In the sitting on Sunday, during the discussion of the rights of the Sultan over Egypt, a tendency was manifested to confirm those rights on a basis precluding the idea of Egypt again becoming a Turkish province. The Porte continues to send circulars to its envoys abroad, declaring that the Conference is inopportune. Arabi states that if the Porte abandons him, he will publish correspondence proving that every step he has taken since September 7 last was instigated by the Porte.

On Thursday M. de Freycinet, in the French Chamber of Deputies, and Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons, made similar declarations concerning the basis of the Conference, which was: the reestablishment of the rights of the Sultan, the maintenance of the rights of the Khedive, the preservation of the liberties of the Egyptians, and the observance of the international engagements of Europe.

There is said to be a growing feeling in England that the Government has acted without foresight or energy on the Egyptian question. A despatch to the New York *Tribune* on Sunday says that no one pretends to know what the Conference will decide, but that, in any event, the English Government will finally insist on Arabi's expulsion. A grant meeting is to be held in London on Thursday to press upon the Government the necessity of taking effectual measures for the protection of British life and property in Egypt. Active warlike preparations are being made in England. The Press Association on Tuesday reported that the War Office had issued orders for 20,000 arms and accoutrements to be ready in four days, and it is stated that 1,000 marines will be sent to the Mediterranean to strengthen the British squadron there. The London *Times*, in a leading article on Monday, said: "It may be taken for granted that there is something more than empty sound behind the preparations at the dock-yards." Tuesday's despatches from England indicated increased activity in the War Department. The *Times* says that matters have been so arranged that there will be no difficulty, in case it should be necessary, in despatching 20,000 men to Egypt in a few days.

Clause 11 of the Repression Bill was discussed in the House of Commons on Wednesday. Mr. Gladstone stated that the Government proposed to introduce words limiting the power of police search at night to occasions where there is reasonable suspicion that a secret society is actually holding a meeting. The Irish members accepted this as a reasonable and important concession. This clause was then adopted by a vote of 259 to 45. On the same day, Mr. Trevelyan, in opposing various limitations to the right of search, appealed to the members to expedite the Repression Bill. Every day, he said, gave the Irish Executive fresh reason to regard the position of the country with deep and increasing anxiety, and added seriously to the responsibility of those who prolonged the discussion. On Thursday Sir Charles Dilke, replying to an inquiry, said that he believed there were still some American citizens imprisoned in Ireland. The House, in Committee, then took up clause 12 of the Repression Bill, which provides for the application of the Alien Act to aliens in Ireland. An amendment limiting the duration of the operation of the Alien Act was rejected. Mr. Morgan Lloyd then moved an amendment applying the Alien Act to the whole United Kingdom. This was finally agreed to by a vote of 228 to 51. Friday was spent in discussing various amendments to clause 12, moved by Irish members. These amendments were all opposed by the Government, and were finally withdrawn. During the debate John Bright said it was obvious that the condition of Ireland was made greatly worse by the subscriptions raised

in America, and by those persons who came from America to participate in conspiracies. He did not hesitate to say that those subjects of the Queen who had taken part in the Chicago Convention were traitors to the Crown. The object of the clause under discussion was, he said, to prevent conspirators of the very deepest dye from exciting the people to disorder. The clause was finally carried by a vote of 132 to 30. Clause 13, dealing the power of justices to summon witnesses, was then passed. Clause 14, for the apprehension of fugitive witnesses, was adopted on Tuesday.

It has been decided that the presentation of the freedom of the city of Dublin to Messrs. Parnell and Dillon shall take place on August 15, the occasion of the opening of the Exhibition and the unveiling of the statue of O'Connell.

On Thursday Mr. Gladstone, replying to a question, said that five weeks ago he made a communication to Sir Stafford Northcote that the Government, to accelerate the settlement of the procedure question, might accept an amendment for closure by a two-thirds majority, but that now it reserves for itself liberty of action on the subject.

A London despatch on Thursday stated that Henry E. Abbey, the American theatrical manager, had signed a contract with Mrs. Langtry, the actress, for a tour in America, beginning in November next.

The French Senate has rejected the bill for the importation of foreign pork, on the ground that it did not offer sufficient guarantees against trichinosis.

The bill for the sale of a portion of the crown jewels and diamonds has passed the French Chamber of Deputies by a vote of 343 to 30, with an amendment that the proceeds shall be applied to the fund for disabled artisans.

The fact that the Emperor William did not accept the resignation of Herr Bitter as Minister of Finance until Tuesday, is regarded in Berlin as an indication that he does not entirely approve the fiscal policy of Prince Bismarck.

A circular prepared by Count Tolstoi, the new Russian Minister of the Interior, has been published, reasserting that officials who do not prevent outrages against the Jews will be immediately dismissed.

The London *Times's* correspondent at Berlin says it is now stated that General Ignatieff resigned the Russian Ministry of the Interior because he could no longer guarantee the safety of the Emperor. Credibility is lent to this view by the fact that since his resignation the political police have been revived.

At a Cabinet council in Madrid, on Thursday, the Minister of Foreign Affairs announced that Uruguay has refused to recognize the right of Spain to satisfaction for the murder of Spanish subjects in the dominions of the Republic. Four Spanish men-of-war will shortly arrive at Montevideo. The insurrection in Uruguay is spreading.

A monster meeting was held in Lisbon on Sunday, at which the Progressists and Republicans "fraternized." Violent revolutionary speeches were made.

A meeting was held in Rome on Sunday, in the grand hall of the Collegio Romano, to do honor to the memory of Charles Darwin. Professor Moleschott delivered an address, in which he reviewed Darwin's career. He said Italian history was a grand illustration of Darwin's theory of the struggle for existence.

A serious discussion is said to be going on in the Chinese Tsung Li Yamen upon the course to be pursued in regard to America's anti-Chinese action. It is generally thought that China's rights have been ruthlessly disregarded, and that the American Government has made itself liable to retaliatory action if such be deemed expedient.

GUILTEAU AND THE "EXPERTS."

THE decision of the President on the application to reprieve Guiteau has been made known, and most properly refuses it, so that it is not worth while to discuss once more the question of his accountability. But the character of the "scientific" movement for his pardon on the ground of insanity deserves more than a passing mention. The "argument" which has been presented to the Attorney-General in support of this movement is enough to make one blush for the sane portion of the American people, who have, of course, to share the shame of the performances of some of their number. What it says is, that though the petition for the pardon on scientific grounds "is only signed by one out of 500 of the physicians of the country," "it is believed that the profession are fairly represented by it and by the explanations which accompany it." "It is believed," also, that "if the petition had been more thoroughly distributed, there is no doubt that thousands of signatures could have been obtained," and, "as it now stands, the signatures represent much of the best expert opinion of the country."

There are about 80,000 physicians and surgeons, good, bad, and indifferent, in the United States. One in 500 makes 160 medical signatures to the petition. That these are selected signatures we infer from the fact that the petition when first started was sent only to those who were known to believe in Guiteau's insanity. That they are representative signatures, in any proper sense of the term, is very unlikely. The assertion that "they represent much of the best expert opinion of the country," is that of the draughtsman of the argument, Mr. Reed, Guiteau's counsel. In fact, the whole superstructure rests on his affirmations. It is he who "believes" the signers of the petition "represent the medical profession, and that they constitute much of the best expert opinion of the country." There is no certainty that anybody else believes it except Guiteau himself. There is no other reason in the world why 160 doctors, selected at haphazard by the prisoner from 80,000, should be erected into a court of appeal to decide the question whether sentence should be executed on a murderer whose trial by the courts of law has lasted one year and been one of the most thorough on record.

We answer to this portion of the argument, and it is a sufficient answer, that "it is believed" that the opinions of these doctors, most of whom never saw Guiteau, are not worth a cent. We know of at least six persons who believe it, and we could, if time were given us, procure the written affirmation of "thousands of others" to the same effect. If the question of Guiteau's guilt has not been settled by the jury, but is still to be settled by a popular or professional vote of any kind, it ought not to be taken in this happy-go-lucky way, but at the polls at a regular election. Tens of thousands of votes in favor both of his innocence and his guilt can be obtained for five dollars apiece, or for a glass of whiskey. Signatures in great numbers in favor of his appointment to a collectorship, or a post-tradership; or even the pas-

torate of a Stalwart church, could be obtained in the same manner.

The absurdity does not stop here, however, for the argument maintains that Guiteau ought to be reprieved because his counsel did not examine "experts" enough; or, in other words, mismanaged the case. He did examine a great many experts, but unfortunately they testified the wrong way. They nearly all said that Guiteau was sane enough to be hanged. So the President has been gravely asked by a lawyer to suspend the course of justice because a prisoner's counsel did not keep on summoning doctors until he could find a respectable number to testify that his client was insane. If this is good ground for a pardon, however, no assassin ought to be executed until he has searched the medical profession of his country thoroughly, and picked out and produced in court such members of it as think from all they hear that he must have been crazy when he committed his crime.

Dr. Beard appears to play a prominent part in the movement, and we presume it is his connection with it which causes the appeal to be made "in the name of Science," but not, we are told, in the name of "Psychology," which "does not plead for Guiteau." Nobody has more respect for experts than we have, but they are fast becoming a great burden to the community, and largely through the habit they are falling into of thinking of themselves and calling themselves "Science," and "Psychology," and "Truth," and other fine names. A man who gives long and close attention to a subject is always entitled to be heard upon it with respect, but then there are subjects on which no expert can become scientific, or anything more than a good judge. There is no such thing as a science of insanity, any more than a science of health. No man can speak with scientific accuracy about the soundness of any mind. All he can say in any given case is: "I have seen a great many undoubtedly insane persons, and judging from these I should call this man insane." No doctor is, therefore, entitled to come forward and say, "Science demands so and so, or thinks so and so, about Guiteau," when what he really means is that G. M. Beard, or F. R. Jones, thinks or demands so and so. It is also very absurd for Mr. Smith or Mr. Brown to call himself "Psychology" in the public prints merely because he has been thinking or reading much about the operations of the human mind. He never can become Psychology by any amount of reading or cogitating, because Psychology is not one of the exact sciences. He might become Astronomy, or Chemistry, or Mathematics, but we observe that the successful cultivators of these sciences never call themselves "Science," or become obstreperous in their demands on the patience and good nature of the Government or the people.

We do not know whether there is any use in calling attention to the growing excesses of the bar all over the country in the defence of criminals, of which this Guiteau case furnishes another illustration, and which is fast making American criminal justice a byword all over the world, and increasing enormously the delays and uncertain-

ty of the law. But the matter is one which calls loudly for some kind of reform. The advocates' duty, even if we accept the widest definition of it ever made, is a professional duty. In defending a prisoner, he remains a lawyer, and is bound to do for him all that a lawyer may properly and honestly do, by way of obtaining a full and fair examination of his case. But of late years the tendency of the counsel is to consider himself the prisoner's agent for facilitating his escape from punishment in any way that may suggest itself; or, if total escape be impossible, the utmost attainable postponement of the sentence. The result is thorough frivolousness in the conduct of the trial—frivolous exceptions, frivolous questions, unnecessary witnesses, endless applications for new trials, for stays of proceedings, for habeas-corpus and certioraris, no matter how hopeless or absurd. If these fail, he goes to work to get up petitions for pardon, and the opinions of "experts," and articles for crazy and venal newspapers, and all the other machinery of "a movement." It now only remains to add assistance in breaking jail to the list of a criminal lawyer's duties, and then the last shred of the professional character will have disappeared from him; instead of being the prisoner's advocate, he will have become his "pard," occupied in getting him out of trouble by any device that comes to hand.

MR. JUSTIN MCCARTHY'S APOLOGY FOR THE LAND LEAGUE.

MR. JUSTIN MCCARTHY, who is better known and, perhaps we may say, more trusted by the English-speaking world than any other member of the Parnellite group in the House of Commons, has written three very interesting letters to the *New York Tribune*, explaining and justifying the course of the Land League in and out of Parliament. He has a singularly modest, candid, persuasive way, which makes agreement with him almost seductive even to the most prejudiced. He has but little difficulty in excusing the action of the Parnellites in resorting to extraordinary modes of obtaining English attention to what they considered Irish grievances. No one who knows anything of the way in which the English mind receives the impact of Irish agitation, will greatly blame them for obstruction under the rules of the House. It was not an Irish device. The English Tories began it. It is, perhaps, in some cases a legitimate weapon of minorities. But Mr. McCarthy fails to excuse the extreme to which it was carried, and the coarse insults to members of the Government with which it was accompanied. Ireland is as much interested as the rest of the world in maintaining popular respect for parliamentary institutions, and for decision by discussion. That respect is the product of many ages of toil and endeavor, and perhaps one of the most valuable acquisitions of modern civilization. That the Parnellites in the struggle of last year did much to weaken or destroy it among their constituents, by the brawls which they got up in the House of Commons, and by finally compelling their expulsion by brute force, there is no

denying. Even Mr. McCarthy's skill in statement cannot put a good face on this.

In his account, too, of the arrest of Mr. Parnell and other Land Leaguers Mr. McCarthy is hardly fair to the Gladstone Cabinet. He describes Mr. Parnell as having made up his mind to give the Land Act a fair trial, at the moment when he was thrown into jail in order that it might have a fair trial. But if this condition of the Parnell mind was known to the initiated, it was not known to the general public. We can testify that in his reported speeches Mr. Parnell began by accepting the Act, and then denounced it as a fraud and subterfuge, and produced as a basis of a "fair rent" the prairie value of the land, which he well knew the Commissioners would not adopt, and began to make preparations for submitting test cases, the object of which, as fairly interpreted by his language, was to prevent the tenants from resorting to the Land Courts, and cause the failure of the whole scheme. This placed Mr. Gladstone between the horns of a cruel dilemma. He had to choose whether he would stand by and see a measure of pacification which he had passed with incredible labor and pains totally nullified, or lock up the chiefs of the League until it got fairly into operation; these chiefs being at the same time his Parliamentary opponents. He chose the latter, and when we say he chose wisely, we by no means excuse the lavish and reckless use of the power of arrest with which Mr. Forster followed it up. Of course the arrests were in a certain sense an act of war, but the war was begun by the Parnellites themselves in the House when they defied the Speaker and resorted to the use of such means as "God and nature had put into their hands."

Mr. McCarthy says nothing to defend the League against accountability for the murders and outrages. To superficial observers who know nothing of the Irish question, this is the most serious omission in his letters. It seems to them very much as the failure of the Northern people to be more impressed by the horrors of war seemed to Englishmen during the Rebellion. But the truth is that the Parnellites in Parliament were no more responsible for the outrages than for the weather. Outrages have been for many generations an expression of Irish discontent. If every Irishman who denounced English rule was to be held responsible for the agrarian crimes committed while he was talking, or soon after, nearly every Irish agitator, from Dean Swift down, would have to be counted a secret sympathizer with murder and mayhem. The Land League and the murders are both symptoms of the same disease. What produced the one produced the other. Doubtless Parnell and his friends might have been more profuse in their condemnation of the crimes, but it was human nature to refuse to be so in the presence of enemies who were fiercely denouncing them as the authors of them, and were using them to show that the production of crime was the only function of the League; the fact being that agrarian crime was a constant Irish phenomenon for nearly two centuries before the League was heard of. Moreover, there is no good reason for believing that the class which com-

mits it would pay the slightest attention to Parnell's reprobation of it. We believe the twenty Molly Maguires who were hanged in Pennsylvania two or three years ago were good Catholics, but the teachings of the Church about assassination had made no impression on them.

SUMMER DINING

To every man compelled to stay in New York during any part of summer, the most serious problem presented by life is undoubtedly where to get a dinner. The class which has this problem presented to it is a large and increasing one, for although families who can afford it go out of town earlier and earlier, and remain out of town later and later, every year, the heads of families who find the means of keeping them out of town for several months have themselves to remain in the city a large part of their time and devote themselves to business. The husband, with his business headquarters in New York and his family established at Newport, Saratoga, Lenox, or some other "resort," is a familiar American type. Moralists may say that this is not the best kind of family life; the husband may himself think, if he be selfish enough to indulge such a thought, that marriage under such circumstances is not all that it might be; but for a very large number of New York husbands no other summer life is at all possible. The married man, thus situated, unless he is very fortunate, finds it out of the question to keep a town cook for himself alone, and he is therefore thrown on his club or on the town for a dinner for many a weary and lonely week during the summer. He is, to all intents and purposes, a bachelor, and helps to swell the large body of bachelors who are perennially in the same plight.

If there is any truth in political economy, the demand for good summer dining-places ought to create a supply. Of course, all the winter places are open, but these are all hot places; and what the summer restaurant-goer wants is a cool place. The clubs are for the most part as hot as any hotel or restaurant dining-room; and we believe there is only one in New York where it is possible to have a dinner *al fresco*. Besides this, everybody does not belong to a club, or want to. Even if membership in them at this time of year does not involve, as the stories of club scandals which get about from time to time give some ground for thinking it does, considerable risk to life and limb, many people care little for club life; and then the occasional reappearance in town of the ladies of the family on shopping excursions of one kind and another makes it desirable that the place should be one to which ladies can be taken.

Now, there is literally no cool summer dining-place of this sort in New York. It is idle to tell the diner that he may go down to Coney Island and dine there in comfort. It is true that he can do so; but he has to make a railroad and steamboat journey to do it, and what he wants is not a journey and a dinner, however good, but a plain dinner without any journey at all. What he wants is a place in the heart of the city where he can get such a dinner as he would have at home, or even a better dinner, to tell the truth, for he is entitled, in view of all the sacrifices he makes for the happiness of his family, to no less, and to have cool evening air blowing about him while he eats it.

Where can fresh air be obtained in such a city as New York? The extraordinary multiplication of what are called "gardens" seems to show that there is a widespread popular belief that fresh air in New York can only be obtained

on the level of the ground. The New York garden, one of the advertised attractions of which is always its coolness, is merely a backyard surrounded with a high boarding or wall. The passion for enclosure is very marked and curious. A garden was constructed by an enterprising hotel proprietor some years ago, and called a "jardin d'été," in which a most excellent dinner could be obtained, but in which the theory that the best air is nearest the ground was pushed to the point of sinking the garden below the level of the street. The result, of course, was the production of a mephitic atmosphere. The idea was carried out still further in Gilmore's Garden. Here, although the owners had an entire block, with which they could do what they pleased, they carefully preserved the walls and roof intact, and thus kept the external air entirely out of the building, and made the promenade inside one of the hottest and most suffocating in the world. This was not a dining-place, but the principle, so far as ventilation is concerned, is precisely the same.

The idea which has led to the development of the New York garden—that to get fresh air you must get as near the ground as possible and surround yourself with a high wall—is clearly a mistaken one. Experience shows that relief can only be obtained by going as high up as possible. To try to persuade people that they can get this by keeping as far down as possible and shutting out even the surrounding air, is a piece of imposture which it is painful to find so long successful. The thing to do is to go up to the roof. This fact has been pointed out over and over again in the interest of the summer restaurant-goer; and the reason why the roof is not utilized for him is hard to see. Any one spending an evening at the recently-opened Metropolitan Alcazar may see how it should, and also how it should not, be done. In this place of amusement an attempt has been made to turn the roof to account as a summer dining-room, but it is only a half-hearted attempt. The place consists of a huge concert-hall, round which, at the elevation of the third story, runs a platform, which may, architecturally, be part of the roof, but bears to the sides of the building the relation of a lofty shelf. This shelf in the evening serves both as a dining-place and a promenade. As it runs round the windows of the concert hall, its atmosphere is a mixture of the cool air surrounding the building and the hot, fetid air coming up from inside. As a restaurant it is, moreover, open to the objection that the tramping up and down of two or three thousand promenaders makes a quiet dinner out of the question. Repose of mind is essential to any real gastronomic enjoyment, and any violent excitement or irritation makes it out of the question. But the arrangement of the dining-shelf at the Alcazar is such as to arouse the guest's worst passions. The promenaders at the Alcazar outnumber the diners ten to one, and have the latter completely at their mercy. Of course, they show none. They crowd in upon the diners, crane their necks over them to see what is going on in the hall below, not infrequently draw chairs up to tables already occupied, and literally and metaphorically "make it hot" for any one who has come to have a quiet dinner and evening *al fresco*.

After dinner there is nothing to do but to suffer in this way at the hands of the promenaders, or to join the promenade and heat one's self by doing so, or to go inside the building, where the atmosphere is like that of a Turkish bath. Notwithstanding all this, the Alcazar shelf is nightly crowded; so great is the longing for a really cool summer dining-place on the roof, that a shelf is welcomed as better than no roof at all, and not even the announcement of the present

management that it will give half a pint of "Bodega sherry" with the dinner can keep people away. If there were any real trouble about getting up to the roof, the long delay in its utilization for the purpose of a summer dining-place could be understood. But there is none. The introduction of elevators has made it possible to have buildings of great height, and to get to the top of them without any exertion, and nothing could show our general devotion to money-getting more discreditably than that elevators have thus far been almost wholly brought into play in places of business or hotels; the use of the elevator in connection with the natural summer dining-room on the roof is still to come. The invention of the elevator, too, has been accompanied by the discovery that electricity can be used for purposes of illumination, and the difference between the electric and all other lights is that it is cool. The final cause of all this is so plain that it is something like impiety to refuse to see it. The climate is warm, and a large part of the population need a cool dining-place. The only place where this can be found is the roof. At the very time when this demand for the roof comes into existence, one invention appears which supplies a means of getting to the roof rapidly and without exertion, and another which gives us what seems like a contradiction in terms, and something almost beyond the power of nature to furnish—a cool yet brilliant light. No one who believes in human progress can doubt, when he looks at the thing in this way, to what it points.

ENGLAND IN THE EGYPTIAN CRISIS.

LONDON, June 15.

SERIOUS as the condition of Ireland still is, and slow as the progress of the repressive legislation regarding her is, the centre of gravity in our political affairs has for the time shifted from Ireland to Egypt. Though decisive events will probably have happened before these lines can reach you, still your readers may naturally wish to know how the Egyptian crisis presents itself to us in England, and in what way it is likely to affect the position of our parties.

The present position is the creation of the Government of Lord Beaconsfield. From the time of Mehmet Ali Pasha onward, the suzerainty of the Sultan over Egypt had become a very vague and shadowy matter, carrying with it no effective control. However, the Turkish Government had by no means lost the hope of recovering its rights, and Sultan Abdul-Aziz intended to do so, but was kept in good humor by Ismail Pasha, who spent a good part of the enormous loans which he raised in Europe in bribing the Sultan and his court. When the deposition of Ismail was resolved on by the Western Powers, the authority of the Sultan was invoked to effect it, and this at once brought back Turkish claims to the realm of practical politics. Even the Conservative English Government which was then in power did not much like such a recognition of the Sultan's sovereignty, but they thought it a less evil than the direct interference of an English and French army, and therefore accepted it. The Sultan saw how much he had gained, and watched eagerly for the next opportunity of reasserting his rights. He had also become possessed with the idea that he might recover that vast and undefined half-spiritual, half-temporal authority which the office of Khalif carries with it over the Mohammedan world, and fancied that through the use of his Khalifal pretensions he might recover in a new direction more than all the prestige which his defeat by Russia had taken from him. The conquest, for so one may call it, of Tunis by France

has lately embittered him against the Western Powers, and made him all the more anxious to tighten his grasp on other Mohammedan lands.

Meanwhile, the financial protectorate of England and France, acting jointly, was going on. Many Englishmen, especially Liberals, regretted its establishment. As it was due to the action of France, and as the action of France was taken in the interest of the holders of Egyptian bonds, it seemed to them tainted in its source. What are these French speculators to us, they said, that we should, for their sakes, involve ourselves in responsibilities in a Mohammedan country, make ourselves parties to a system which squeezes taxes by cruelty out of a wretched peasantry, and enter a partnership with France which is almost sure to end in a quarrel? Far better to have annexed Egypt at once, which Lord Beaconsfield might have done in 1875, when France was in no condition to resist. We should then have become masters of the situation; might have governed Egypt so as to make it pay its way and yet improve the condition of the peasantry; might have had the Suez Canal all to ourselves instead of being merely the holders of some shares in it. It is indeed a little odd that Lord Beaconsfield, who was fond of bold schemes, did not try this one; but probably he feared the vehement opposition which would have proceeded from Mr. Gladstone, and was held back by Lord Derby and other timid or cautious members of his own Cabinet. Anyhow, he was content, conceiving it absolutely necessary not to let France get alone the mastery of Egypt, to act in company with her, and thus he left matters when he resigned office in 1880.

The Government of Mr. Gladstone accepted and maintained the *status quo*. They could not retire from Egypt, because to do so would be to leave France able to work her own will, and would seem to throw the Canal, our route to India through which a vast trade now passes, at France's mercy. Therefore they kept things going, and hoped for the best, endeavoring to maintain a friendly concert with the various French Governments, which unfortunately change so fast as to increase the difficulties of a steady and consistent diplomacy. Last September the revolt of the Colonels seemed for a time to threaten a complete break-up of the system, and ever since it has been clear that our position was extremely precarious. Those who know Egypt have been warning us to prepare for a catastrophe; but unluckily they have not had many useful suggestions to give as to the course we must pursue, and even now, when the storm has broken, it is wonderful how little prepared public opinion is to arrive at definite practical conclusions. There are of course the usual three courses, but none of them is satisfactory. The first is to withdraw altogether from Egypt, and leave her affairs to settle themselves. It is plain, it looks easy, it naturally suggests itself to a transatlantic observer. It is pressed upon us by two sections of politicians, but both are small, and one is insignificant. The party of non-intervention, who desire to see England keep wholly aloof from the internal affairs of all other countries, to have no diplomatic dealings except in matters which obviously affect our direct material interests, and never to draw the sword except in self-defence—this party would of course be glad if we should cut the Egyptian knot by abandoning Egypt altogether. However, it contains few persons of any weight or eminence, and has really no influence in Parliament. The other section can scarcely be called a party, for it consists only of a few writers, mostly Englishmen who have lived in Egypt and become interested in Mohammedanism, who urge that we ought not to interfere with the legitimate development of the country

as a people and a state, who declare that a National party has grown up on the banks of the Nile, and that it will work out the happiness and greatness of the nation if left to itself. The answer made to these arguments is that this National party is a dream of enthusiasts, and that there are no materials for self-government in Egypt; while the non-interventionists are reminded that the general sentiment of England would never tolerate a Government which abandoned our highway to the further East.

At the opposite pole from these doctrines stand those who think it would have been better to, so to speak, take the bull by the horns, and, on the first symptoms of revolt against the Khedive and hostility against Europeans, land English and French troops, fortify Alexandria, and march on Cairo. Very few people have as yet ventured to advocate so daring a course. The Liberals don't like it, because it is the maximum of intervention, and because, remembering the issue of the Schleswig-Holstein occupation by Prussia and Austria, they think that England and France would sooner or later come to a quarrel, which would be a serious quarrel, over their prey. The Conservatives have not called for it, partly because they also feel these dangers; partly because they have a lingering sympathy with the Turks, and see that such a course would be strongly resented by the Sultan, whose rights over Egypt they admit. And the gravest objection of all is that such decided action by England and France would probably give grave umbrage to the other four Powers which signed the Treaty of Berlin, and might conceivably lead to a European war. This is a point on which one who does not know the secret diplomatic history of the question can hardly speak; but supposing it not to be a serious danger (and it may not be), the course of events during the last few days has gone far to show that the error of England and France has been not to have shown more audacity, not to have followed up their threats by an immediate display of overwhelming force. And it is quite possible that the Conservative leaders may before long take this line, and place upon this ground those charges which they are sure to bring against Mr. Gladstone's policy. Hitherto they seem to have been waiting to see what turn events will take, fearing to commit themselves prematurely to a view which might be suddenly refuted. This is the fair privilege of an Opposition; what is stranger is that among all our speakers and writers hardly any one has had any definite line of conduct to propose. Everybody is perplexed. Everybody feels that we are in a position theoretically indefensible, and almost sure to involve misfortune. Thus it happens that even the acquiescence of our Government in the action of the Sultan, who has at last found, and is using with true Oriental craft, the opportunity of making his claims effective, has excited less censure than might have been looked for. The Tories, of course, twit Mr. Gladstone with his asking aid from the "unspeakable Turk"; the Liberals see with disgust that the Sultan is likely to strengthen an authority for whose extinction they have been anxiously waiting. But no one has demanded that the Turkish claims should be disregarded and the solution sought by the armies of France and England alone.

It may, however, happen that the danger in which, as the events of June 11 at Alexandria show, the Europeans in Egypt stand, will, after all, compel our forces to land. It is not yet clear, but you will probably know before these lines are in print, how far the massacre of that day was due to distinctly political or religious motives, how far merely an outbreak of that vast population of ruffians who infest Alexandria,

and who would naturally seek an occasion for plunder and violence. But there can be no doubt that Europeans are unpopular in Egypt, and that, on the whole, they deserve to be so. Every country of Western and Southern Europe sends a great many of its least estimable children to make and lose fortunes in half-civilized regions like Egypt and other parts of the East; and Egypt, as the richest district, has had the largest share of this mischievous emigration. We are so much accustomed to dwell on the superiority of our own civilization, and the excellence of our intentions, that we do not quite realize that the impression produced on the Oriental mind may be different. Yet, whatever be the demerits of the Europeans in the Levant, they are entitled to the protection of their Governments; and if this is not speedily given by Turkish troops, there will be a loud call that it should be given by England and France themselves. Y.

LAST DAYS OF THE ITALIAN LIBERATOR.

MILAN, June 7, 1882.

As the cable will have brought you the fatal news, I did not intend to send you a letter until the last sad rites were over, but, owing to various obstacles, these are not yet performed, and certainly to-day there is no chance of their completion. Yet Garibaldi's instructions were very clear. On September 27, 1877, he wrote to Dr. Prandina directing him to perform the operation of cremation, as he had decided on having his body burned. The funeral pyre was to be raised 300 paces to the left of the White House, to the north looking seaward; here acacia, myrtle, cistus, and other aromatic faggots should be piled, the iron bedstead which had served him as a bed and carriage placed on top, and finally, on an open bier, his body, clothed in his red shirt; the ashes should be collected and enclosed in an urn, to be set in a niche in the wall behind the graves of two of his children—Anita, a beautiful young girl of seventeen, daughter of a woman whom he loved in Nice, and Rosa, a baby of eighteen months (born to him after Clelia), who died during the French campaign, and, the parish priest of Maddalena denying her funeral rites, the mother buried her in the island, and Garibaldi, on returning, was so pleased with the idea that he straightway decided on being buried there himself. In a letter to his present wife, written in 1881, he expressly enjoins on her to burn his body, as directed, before announcing his death to any one—a most characteristic injunction—accompanied by the promise to do the same for her should she precede him to the tomb. He assuredly would have kept his promise, nor would any government have dared to interfere with him; but the poor widow, with two young children, alone on the island, could not have taken on her shoulders such a responsibility. She had to wait for Menotti, summoned as soon as danger threatened, and even he arrived too late. Then he resolved to await his brother and sister—Ricciotti from Rome, Teresa and her husband, Canzio, from Genoa—and meanwhile the news had got abroad, and the prefect of Sassari, chief man in the island of Sardinia, stepped in to say that he could not allow any cremation without orders from the Government. Menotti warned him fairly that, at the cost of his life, he would see his father's behest obeyed; and meanwhile from all Italy, as the news sped with lightning rapidity, came a wail of woe, then the passionate entreaty: "Embalm him! Let us see his face once more, or let us at least have his ashes for the Pantheon or the Capitol." Menotti opposed a stern but sad refusal, promising, however, to have the

body embalmed so as to be able to defer the cremation ceremony until the representatives of the King, of the two houses of Parliament, of every municipality in Italy, should be able, with the representatives of the press and other thousands of citizens, to reach the island. But when embalming was attempted it was too late, and too late for the erection of the simple funeral pyre as Garibaldi wished it. Such a step being distinctly illegal, it was clear that the Government could not sanction it by being personally present; so Doctor Pini, who superintends the crematory of Milan, erected on the Gorini system, went over last night with Deputy Crispi to prepare all decently and in order.

A special iron coffin has been despatched from Sassari, but as I write comes a telegram from the family: "Friday is the very earliest day that can be fixed for the funeral," and if this state of things augments the grief of all, what must it be for the family, who have to watch day by day and hour by hour "Decay's defacing fingers" gradually effacing the marble calm and luminous seraphic smile which overspread the face as soon as the death agony was over! That, indeed, was terrible to witness—terrible and unexpected. When we first saw Garibaldi after 1876, when he left Rome in tolerable health and could still use his limbs freely, save when periodical attacks prostrated him, we were shocked at the awful change. Still, he bore bravely the agitation of the inaugural ceremony at Milan to the martyrs of Mentana; then, when we were fearing the worst, alighted at Naples, seemed there to take a new lease of life, and performed the wonderful feat of travelling by land from Naples to Reggio; crossed the Faro, then again by land from Messina to Palermo. Though literally but the shadow of himself, his intellect was so clear, his smile so radiant, his interest in his *picciotti* so keen, that one grew to believe with the Neapolitans that he could never die. A somewhat sharp attack, however, at Palermo warned him that if he would breathe his last in his beloved hermitage he must return immediately, and this he did in the same Government frigate, the *Esploratore*, whose officers had borne him so tenderly from Caprera to Naples that he suffered not at all. They were only too proud, and the feat of securing to him a painless voyage from Palermo to Caprera was renewed. Once there he seemed to revive, so much so that toward the end of May Doctors Albanese and Sirletti left Caprera, enjoining solely on his family to prevent his being tired or excited by receiving people.

He led his regular life, getting up early and, when the weather permitted, going down in his little hand-carriage to the sea, always accompanied by his darling Manlio. Despite his age and infirmities (the malady known as deforming arthritis having twisted his poor hands and completely paralyzed his lower limbs), despite even a severe bronchial attack, his voice was still vibrating and sonorous. He would call the peasants from the adjoining fields, give them directions, ask after their families without even appearing weary, so healthy were his lungs to the last. At eleven o'clock he returned to the house to eat, preferring one special dish, which is the favorite dainty of the Neapolitans—a cake made of flour with onions and tomatoes, called "pizze"; then if still hungry he would call for a large piece of meat, have it thrown on to the fire, and, the frizzled part being cut off, would eat it, let the piece frizzle again, and so on till it was finished. The doctor who gives me these details expressing some curiosity, not unmixed with disgust, at this pre-Adamite cookery, Garibaldi answered, "I eat now from choice as I ate perforce during my long journey in South America, where I had

neither cooks nor saucepans, and was only too glad to come across a wild buffalo to stave off hunger." The rest of the day he passed sometimes in a spacious room, where he had a window specially made, whence he could see the sea and the Maddalena; at other times in being drawn around the island. On the 24th of May the doctor, who had remained at home with Manlio, who was indisposed, saw that the General, who came in later than usual, was looking very sad and weary. Afterward he learned that he had been to visit the tombs of Anita and Rosa, where he had himself decided to be buried. Unfortunately, there were no signs that cold taken during that pilgrimage had fastened on the bronchial tubes, but it was so; difficulty in breathing and, later, difficulty in swallowing became excessive; and on the very day when letters reached Canzio at Genoa and Menotti at Rome saying that their father was better, came telegrams urging them to hasten if they would see their father yet alive. From that hour paralysis seized on the larynx, and not even a drop of water could the sufferer swallow. Manlio, his "Benjamin," was also ill, and he waited with patient but ever-increasing anxiety for the arrival of his favorite doctor, Albanese. "Is the steamer in sight?" were almost his last words; his very last, the name of the darling of his old age, "Manlio."

At six o'clock the surgeon of the Government steamer *Cariddi*, who was in attendance, pronounced life extinct, but it was a syncope, and the death agony lasted yet three hours. At five minutes to nine on Friday, June 2, the great champion of the oppressed passed away forever. For the first few moments, we are told, the face was awful to look upon, as are ever the faces of those who die by suffocation. Then, when life had relaxed her hold, it settled down peacefully, a halo of intense calm composing every feature. The sailors of the *Cariddi* were allowed to handle the beloved form, dress it in the red shirt and poncho, and lay it on the bed where it still lies—"a marble mask," writes our correspondent, "of what yesterday was Garibaldi." Very, very few have been permitted to enter the illuminated hall. Poor Sgarallino, one of Garibaldi's favorite officers, wounded on the Volturmo in 1860, who spent a great deal of his time at Caprera, and had helped the General with hammer and chisel to scoop out an old millstone which was to serve as the basis for the funeral pyre, fainted across the threshold. This grief is but a type of that universally felt. Never could I have imagined such scenes as I have witnessed. It seems as if the pulse of the nation had ceased to beat. All the Government and communal schools are closed, and though some private clerical schools attempted to hold their classes as usual, and the parents also sent their children, a regular rebellion occurred, the young ones refusing to carry on their usual avocations with Garibaldi lying dead. I have witnessed the national mourning for Cavour, Mazzini, Victor Emmanuel—sincere, as far as it went, in all cases, and for Mazzini among many the grief was passionate and deep; but now it seems as if every one had lost his or her nearest and best. Here in Milan it is no exaggeration to say that when, on Sunday, all the associations formed in procession, with banners at the head, all Milan accompanied them to the cemetery as they bore the bust of Garibaldi. And when, for fear of being shut out from the gates, as only the members of the associations were to be admitted, confusion occurred, and worse was threatened, it sufficed that Colonel Bruzzesi, one of Garibaldi's veterans, said, "For Garibaldi's sake, be still," and a hush fell over the crowd that was unbroken until the end of the ceremony.

But I should never end if I were to recount all the manifestations of this intense universal national grief. You know that Parliament at once voted 60,000 francs annual pension—that is, 10,000 francs for each of the five children—Menotti, Ricciotti, Teresita, Clelia, and Manlio—and 10,000 francs for the widow; this because Garibaldi's pension of 50,000 francs a year expired at his death. Enormous sums are already subscribed in each town, city, and village for a monument to Garibaldi to be erected *there*, so that each man, woman, and child can see it beside his own special belfry tower. The King's grief was heartfelt, his letter to Menotti most graceful:

"My father taught me, when a boy, to honor in Garibaldi the virtues of the citizen and soldier. An eye-witness of his glorious deeds, there grew up within me a profound affection mingled with the deepest gratitude and admiration. All this doubles for me the weight of his irreparable loss. I share the supreme grief of the Italian people and of the family, and I beg you to be the interpreter of my condolences, of my participation in the sorrow of the entire nation."

The conduct of France, as a whole, and of the French Chambers especially, has poured a balm into the recent wounds inflicted on Italy by French Chauvinism, but—will you believe it?—the French consul resident in Milan refused to float the national tricolor here where every other nation has floated its flag, veiled in mourning. The workmen, exasperated already by the ill treatment of their comrades by Frenchmen, were for attacking the consul's office, and were with difficulty restrained by their leaders, all old Garibaldians. These gave the consul twenty-four hours to explain or apologize; then, as he still kept silence, addressed to him a dignified yet indignant letter, denying him the character of a French representative, and a copy of the letter has been sent to Mancini, Minister of Foreign Affairs.

I conclude by sending you what you may have forgotten—a splendid letter written by Garibaldi to friends in the United States, when the question of the *Alabama* was pending between England and America:

"My friends: I have ever held from the first moment that the American question was one of those which interest the entire world, all humanity; and it grieved me to the quick to see that a fraction of the English public was opposed to the reestablishment of the Union of the great republic. This opposition, as no one can be ignorant, is the result of old rancor lurking still between England and America. It was indeed a sad thing to see thus astray the good sense of that people which was the first to affirm the principle of the emancipation of slaves. One would have expected them unanimously to applaud the Americans of the North, whom Providence has chosen as executors of this sublime idea, but I would fain hope that these lords of the ocean will make up their quarrels and come to terms for the benefit of oppressed humanity. Sons of the same mother, they ought to comprehend that their noble race to-day forms the bulwark of the rights of nations, and that dissensions are expressly sown between them by the upholders of despotism. Despotism fears them, knowing that as long as they remain on terms of friendship, it will be impossible for them to carry out their designs, ever fatal to liberty.—Ever yours,
G. GARIBALDI, Caprera.

"May, 1865."

P. S.—Just as I was mailing my letter I receive the following telegram from Caprera: "Garibaldi's body is not to be burnt, but the remains will be transported to the Janiculum." Your readers will remember that the Church of San Pietro in Montorio, on the summit of the Janiculum, was the centre of Garibaldi's military operations during the siege of Rome in 1849. The belfry tower was shattered by French bombs. Just below it are buried the remains of Ciceracchio and other victims shot to death by the Austrians, who captured the thirteen fishing boats in which Garibaldi hoped to reach Venice after his flight from Rome, saying: "Venice is

still left to die for." It was then that Anita, the mother of his children, faithful wife, nurse, fellow-soldier, friend, died in his arms. The Austrian soldiery hung, drew, and quartered the peasant who had harbored her in her dying hour. Thence, as soon as the body was buried in the hole dug by Garibaldi himself and one Leggero, he escaped to Chiavari, was imprisoned, and took refuge at Tunis. Driven thence and refused protection at Gibraltar, he received hospitable shelter in New York, and earned his living with a tallow chandler on Staten Island. He returned to fight against the Austrians in 1859.

GARIBALDI AND THE MOVEMENT OF 1848.

LONDON, June 8, 1882.

THIS is not the season for analyzing Garibaldi's character, or for weighing against his greatness faults which in so far as they had a real existence were little else than his virtues looked at from the wrong side. No one who belongs to the generation whose day-dream was the unity of Italy, would care to sit down in cold blood and criticise the hero who has breathed his last at Caprera. It is sufficient for those who feel that the romance of politics is for them buried in Garibaldi's tomb to know that their hero was, whatever his petty foibles, worthy of the admiration which more than thirty years ago he kindled in the hearts of all that was youthful and hopeful and generous and high-minded throughout Europe. The cause for which he fought and suffered, and with which he triumphed, was noble, and he was worthy to be the hero of the cause of Italy. But though this is no opportunity for criticising the defender of Rome and the liberator of Naples, Garibaldi's death affords a fitting occasion for pressing on public attention one or two reflections which belong rather to the field of history than of politics, and which, if in one sense obvious, have nevertheless a certain permanent importance. His death marks the close of an era. A few veterans of the revolutionary struggle still linger on the stage. Kosuth is alive, but the Hungarian patriot is himself a memory of the past, not a living power. Of the men who came to the front in 1848, scarcely one of any eminence is still found among us, and if any statesman or revolutionist of that era yet survives, we feel instinctively that he belongs to a past age. The nationalist movement of 1848, of which the watchwords were nationality and liberty, has run its course. We can regard it with something like historical impartiality, and can draw from its successes no less than from its failures at least four more or less important conclusions.

First. The visionaries or fanatics who, fifty years ago, began to trouble the repose of all sensible and respectable persons with their clamor about the rights of nations and the tyranny of kings, understood or felt the wants of the time far more truly than did even the most moderate and far-seeing of the politicians who honestly denounced the revolutionary movements which disturbed Europe. Any one who thinks it worth while to do so, may denounce the recklessness or the criminality of the men who conspired and plotted against the Emperor of Austria, the King of Naples, the King of France, or the Princes of Germany. The one thing which no sane critic can now venture to assert is, that these conspirators did not understand the tendency of the time. All the main objects of revolutionary effort have now, in fact, been achieved. Italy is independent, France is a Republic, Germany is united, the Constitution of Hungary is restored. For good or for bad, the cause of nationality, and in France at any rate the cause of republicanism, has triumphed. Enthusiasts have turned out

—not for the first time—more keen-sighted than men of sound sense and educated judgment. Nor need this excite any surprise. To know the feelings of the world, to enter into the prevailing sentiment of an age, to experience in one's own heart the suffering which harasses or the hope which cheers thousands of one's fellows, is precisely the gift of men and women who are blessed or cursed with a capacity for enthusiasm or faith. No one can now doubt that the passion for Italian unity which devoured Mazzini was shared by all his countrymen high and low. The career of Pio Nono is proof enough that hatred of foreign oppressors had in 1848 entered the Vatican; the whole life both of Charles Albert and of Victor Emmanuel proves that zeal for Italian independence had found a home in the palace of an Italian prince. Nor can any one now hesitate to say that enthusiasm for nationality was not confined to Italy. The soldiers and the statesmen of Germany were compelled at last by the very spirit of the age to adopt that belief in national independence which had been preached for more than half a century by rebels and zealots.

Secondly. The faith or passion which leads men to understand or feel the wants of their age, is no guarantee for their ability to point out or practise the method by which these wants may be satisfied. The revolutionists of 1848 were for the most part the victims of a prevalent delusion fostered by a misreading of the history of the last French Revolution. They all placed unlimited trust in the miraculous effects of insurrection. The "people" rising in their might were, it was supposed, capable of routing the strongest and best disciplined armies. Mazzini to the end of his life, or at any rate till very late in his career, cherished the idea that the war of the peoples could accomplish miracles not to be achieved by the armies of kings. There is the less reason for wondering at the tenacity with which a man of his genius clung to this notion, because it is pretty plain that in 1848, at least, monarchs really shared the belief of rebels. The way in which one crowned head after another yielded during the revolutionary year to the demands of mobs which could have been scattered by a regiment of soldiers, is explainable by nothing but the panic caused by the very idea of insurrection. The basis of fact which gave a certain support to what, after all, must be pronounced a mere delusion, was that occasionally, though by no means so often as is generally supposed, the army "fraternized" with the mob, and further, that trained soldiers are at some disadvantage when called upon to resist citizens in the midst of narrow streets, where military manoeuvres are impossible, and where every house may be turned into an improvised fortress. This belief in the transcendent power of insurrection was a delusion which, in one instance after another, proved the ruin of revolutionary efforts. Whenever, during the last thirty-four years, a government has been able to count on the support of a trained army, it has invariably succeeded in putting down every force which enthusiasm or courage could enlist in support of the popular cause. At Paris, at Naples, at Berlin, at Dresden, at Vienna, in every large town throughout Europe, the people have at one time or another come into serious conflict with the army; and on every occasion on which the army stood faithfully by the Government and the Government did not yield to panic, the people have been totally defeated. In February, 1848, Thiers proposed to Louis Philippe to retreat with the army to St. Cloud. If the King had taken the advice of his Minister, he would assuredly have returned in triumph to Paris. The experience of 1871 throws light on the policy which would have saved the

crown in 1848. The essential weakness of mobs is the most important though certainly by no means the most cheering lesson of 1848. That Mazzini never learned it was the secret of at least half his failures.

Thirdly. The Italians, and notably Mazzini, who preached the doctrine of nationality, never in their own minds dissociated the belief in national independence from the belief in personal freedom. Their tendency, indeed, was to believe that republicanism had an essential connection with the belief in national unity. The association between ideas of national independence and individual liberty was in their case perfectly natural, for in the case of Italy the two notions were practically inseparable. The petty princes of the country were tyrants, and their tyranny was supported by the bayonets of Austria. To expel the Austrians was to establish free institutions. Any system of free government was sure, as was seen in the case of Piedmont, to come into collision with the domination of the hated foreigners. The despots, moreover, of the Continent owed their power to treaties which had violated every national sentiment. In this instance, a few revolutionists and kings almost of necessity fell into a common error. The oppressor and the oppressed both believed that aspirations for national independence of necessity involved the desire for republican freedom. We now see that this belief was erroneous. Italy gained her unity under the guidance of an Italian prince, and Germany has been united into an empire under a ruler who in 1848 was prepared to support the authority of the Prussian crown by pouring grapeshot on the mob of Berlin, and through the instrumentality of a Minister who has throughout life been the sworn foe of parliamentary government. The error of conceiving that there was some natural connection between the so-called doctrine of nationality and the dogmas of liberalism or republicanism led, like all errors, to unfortunate results. Mazzini, to whom Italy owed her new birth, was not able to recognize in the country which preferred the monarchy of the House of Savoy to a renovated Roman republic the work of his own labor and self-sacrifice, while Germans have proved far too ready to sacrifice every security for unity on the altar of national liberty. Nor have the practical ill results of a speculative mistake been confined to Italy and to Germany. The sentiment of nationality has in one country after another been substituted for the desire for good government. The nineteenth century has in this, as in other cases, preferred sentiment to reason. Utilitarianism has nowadays a bad name, but the world would gain a great deal if the standard of utility could be once more made among thoughtful politicians the acknowledged test of good government. The notion that a national despotism is better than good government under foreign rule is one which, if pushed to extreme limits, may well become fatal to the liberty and to the progress of mankind.

Fourthly. The revolutions of 1848 bear an unmistakable impress of romance. Whoever reads with intelligence and sympathy the letters of A. H. Clough, the correspondence of George Sand, or the work in which Daniel Stern has left a permanent record of a transitory phase of sentiment, must perceive that even in Paris the tone of the time was one of generous if of childish enthusiasm. The absurdities of the day, the trees of liberty, the processions, the harangues, the general expressions of philanthropy, the rhetoric of Lamartine, the magic influence exercised for a moment by a poet who suddenly found himself the most conspicuous politician in Europe, the advances made by the Church to the

democracy, the hopefulness with which democrats welcomed the idea that the Pope might be the restorer of Italian independence and the patron of human liberty, the confidence or simplicity which led statesmen and patriots to believe that the oaths of Ferdinand of Naples could be anything else than the mask of treachery—these and a thousand other signs are all evidences of the spirit of confidence and enthusiasm which for a moment spread from one end of Europe to the other. What lent a peculiar tinge of romance to the nationalist movement was, that, unlike the revolutions of the eighteenth century, it was or appeared to be an effort not only of reformation, but also of restoration. Its leaders, if they looked with hope toward the future, gazed also with reverence and sympathy on the past. To renew in a nobler form the glories of the Holy Roman Empire, to reestablish and reform the Constitution of Hungary, to make Rome the moral centre of the world, to restore the unity of Italy, were aims which it seemed to the men of 1848 might be accomplished by devotion to the spirit of freedom and of nationality. The notion, in fact, of nationality seemed to its devotees to solve the problems of the age, and to make it for the first time possible for reformers to unite admiration for what was good in the middle ages with adherence to the doctrines of human equality and of universal philanthropy which inspired the true heroes of the great French Revolution. The romance which had been learnt from the pages of Scott and Manzoni might, it seemed, be combined with the democratic creed of the *Contrat Social*.

The romance which colored the whole movement of 1848 had, from the nature of things, more influence in Italy than in any other country of Europe. Misfortune and oppression had robbed Italians neither of their talent nor of their grace. To those who can still recall the time when the "cause of Italy" excited the sympathy and warmed the imagination of every youth who had a heart to feel pity for the victims of oppression, or a brain to imagine the beauty and nobility of Italy when at last restored to her place among the nations, it is impossible not to feel that the Italian exiles and leaders possessed a charm of character and of manner not to be found in the men of other countries. This idea is possibly a mere trick of memory. To the youths of to-day a Bulgarian or an Armenian may, for aught I know, be as interesting as was a Greek or a Pole to the enthusiasts of 1830, or as was an Italian refugee to the generation who came to manhood between 1848 and 1860. However this may be, it is a simple historical fact that the glow of romance which colored all the movements of 1848 shed a special halo of glory round the cause of Italy. Here it was far more easy than elsewhere to blend the romance of mediævalism with the romance of revolutionary republicanism. The history of the land lent itself to republican ideals. To call the movement which ultimately achieved the unity of Italy romantic, will seem to many persons to be equivalent to calling it fantastic or Quixotic. Nothing, however, is further from my intention than to speak in any other language than that of fervent admiration for a cause which has none the less claim on our sympathy and respect because it has now been crowned with success, and stands no longer, I rejoice to think, in want of foreign help or of foreign good-will. The consideration which has led me to dwell on the romantic aspect of the Italian revolution is that persons who have witnessed the triumphs achieved by the policy of Bismarck and the strategy of Moltke are very much prone to underrate the salutary effects of romance and enthusiasm. It is perfectly true that every page in the history of 1848-9 illustrates the dictum,

"Enthusiasm runs away." Time after time proof was given that enthusiastic volunteers could not in the long run compete with disciplined soldiers. The force of an insurrection drove Radetsky out of Milan, but in a few months his soldiers brought him back as a conqueror.

This fact and all that it suggests should never be forgotten; the glory of Cavour is, that he learned, and made others learn, the true lessons of Italian defeat. But the admirers of big battalions have a good deal to learn from zealots. Garibaldi would at any time have been defeated by generals of far less competence than officers trained in the school of Moltke. But Garibaldi and the men of whom he is the representative achieved feats which could never have been performed by Bismarck, or by all the collective generalship of Prussia. You must judge of men such as Mazzini or Garibaldi as you would of prophets and apostles. They are the teachers, in different forms, of a new faith. Looked at in this point of view, their very defeats are often triumphs. Garibaldi's entrance into Naples was not his greatest act. If he is to have a tomb, it is quite right that his tomb should be placed on the Janiculum, for the noblest service he ever rendered to his country was the defence of Rome. When the French troops entered the city under Oudinot, France was disgraced and had already merited the *Coup d'état*. As Garibaldi retreated, Italy triumphed, and her cause became for the first time the cause of every man throughout the civilized world who loved justice and freedom. The mere material advantages of European sympathy to Italy cannot be easily overrated. But Garibaldi and the men with whom he was associated achieved far more for Italy than merely enlisting in her favor the sympathy of mankind. They made it impossible that the country should gain unity without gaining liberty.

Cavour's scorn of governing by means of a "state of siege" has become a sort of proverb. The refusal to achieve temporary success by a kind of violence which, even when it answers for the moment, makes success hardly worth attaining, is characteristic of the noblest side of the Italian revolution, and, I may add, of the noblest side of the whole movement of 1848. A great deal of ungenerous and inconsiderate sarcasm is constantly directed against the professors and others who during the revolutionary year sat in the German Parliament at Frankfort. Their weakness, their indecision, their failure, is contrasted by every devotee of force with the strength, the resolution, the success of Bismarck. The contrast is impressive. One fact ought not, however, to be forgotten. The professors or pedants who failed at Frankfort aimed at giving to their country both unity and freedom. The Prussian Minister fixed his eye on a far inferior object. He sought for and attained unity, but he sacrificed without regret the hope of combining union with liberty. The leaders of the Italian revolution were more fortunate or more skilful than either the professors or the generals of Germany. Italy is united and Italy is free. At the present moment Bismarck and Bismarck's system receive the indiscriminate admiration which the world lavished thirteen or fourteen years ago upon the French Emperor and the Imperial régime. It is hardly rash to anticipate that the time will come, and at no distant date, when the world will esteem the imperialism of Germany not much higher than the imperialism of France, or will at any rate perceive how much Germany has lost by the fact that her unity was secured through means fatal to her freedom. Italy, it may well be conceded, has suffered much from want of a general like Moltke, and still more

from want of armies like those which Moltke directed. But the day will assuredly come when acknowledgment must be made that Germany has suffered much from the failure to produce any hero like Garibaldi. Romance and generosity are powers no less than discipline and strategy.

A. V. DICEY.

Correspondence.

THE HOMŒOPATHS AND THE REGULARS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: An editorial in your issue of June 15, headed "Doctor and Patient," is so inaccurate and superficial in some respects that it should not go uncriticised. A constant reader of your journal for fifteen years, I am thoroughly convinced of your earnest desire to give expression only to the best thought and its results upon any and every subject, and I trust that you will allow me to try to show you that in this editorial you have fallen into grave error.

You say: "We have the medical profession thus divided into two bodies, both of which believe equally in the value of professional training and the possibility of treating disease according to rules derived from experience; both of which possess a high degree of skill, training, and education. They differ as to a dogma of the truth of which laymen have hardly any means of judging. . . . He [the layman] does not regard, and never can be brought to regard, a highly educated and trained physician as a 'quack' merely because of a difference between him and his rival around the corner on a recondite matter like that which divides homœopaths from allopaths. The enormous growth of the homœopathic body in the last fifty years shows that the rule does not prevent what the regulars regard as medical error from spreading," etc.

Now, I submit that the difference between scientific medicine and homœopathy is not one of a big *versus* a little dose, of dissimilars *versus* similars. The real and vital difference lies here: the regular school (we repudiate the nickname "allopath," which implies that we also have an infallible theory for the selection of our remedies) starts with no theory with which its practice must be made to accord; avails itself of every honest means, no matter what the source or method of application, which is or may be of service in the relief of human suffering; collects facts, and, making use of theory only in its true sphere, holds itself in readiness to discard any theory the moment the facts belie it. Homœopathy, on the other hand, does start with a theory with which its practice is made to accord, and this cherished theory is one which, during all the years since it was promulgated, the vast majority of physicians the world over have not been able to reconcile with the facts of observation. In short, the position of the regular school is non-dogmatic, broad, and truly scientific; that of homœopathy is dogmatic, narrow, and eminently unscientific.

Next, with regard to the "enormous growth" of homœopathy: it is but lately that one of its journals was lamenting the fact that it is not growing at present. It is true that it has grown in this country—so has Spiritualism, for that matter—but in the land of its birth and in France it is almost extinct, and in England it has made comparatively little headway. If homœopathy is merely another way of arriving at truth, how does it happen that it is unrepresented in the state universities of Germany?

Surely no one can accuse the Germans of any lack of intellectual radicalism. I have no hesitation in adducing foreign examples to the *Nation*, which has so often given its readers reason to think that it does "care for abroad," and does believe that even we Americans may learn something from the "effete European despotisms."

You imply that there is nothing to choose between the two schools as regards "skill, training, and education." There are skilful and well-educated homœopaths, and there are, unhappily, unskilful and half-educated members of the regular school; but, if you would give yourself the trouble to investigate the facts, you would find that the average of attainment is decidedly higher in the regular school. What physicians prominent in science have been homœopaths? How large a proportion of the graduates of our leading colleges who study medicine enlist in the homœopathic ranks?

I believe the main reasons for the spread of homœopathy in the United States—the state examination in Canada is so severe that homœopaths religiously avoid that portion of America—are briefly these: First, the superficial character of much of the education in this country (a point on which the *Nation* has often dwelt); secondly, the American doctrine that one man is as good as another, and perhaps a little better (a doctrine which has also incurred your criticism, especially when it is illustrated in appointments to office for which special training is desirable); and, thirdly, the popular sympathy which is always enlisted in behalf of any man or body of men supposed to be persecuted in any way.

A physician who has had any experience knows perfectly well that, in order to succeed in making money by the practice of medicine, only one thing is absolutely necessary—a good knowledge of human nature: so easily can the non-medical public be imposed upon, and so ignorant are even the most enlightened people as to what constitutes evidence in any problem of physical science.

Homœopathy will die in this country just as it has died in Germany, and would die rapidly but for the active opposition of the regular school. Consequently, although I disagree entirely with your premises, I am inclined to think that the action of the New York State Medical Society is wise, and that the best course for all parties concerned is to permit consultations wherever the interests of the patient would seem to be furthered thereby. When Mr. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, or Senator Jones, of Nevada, expounds finance, or when a Western newspaper instructs Mr. Gladstone on the Eastern question, the *Nation* derives much the same kind of amusement from their utterances that those of its readers who love medicine and its progress are afforded by your article on "Doctor and Patient."—Yours truly,

S.

Boston, June 19, 1882.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Many constant readers of the *Nation* regret that the article, "Doctor and Patient," in the issue of June 15, presents such a very local view of the question discussed. Thus, the assertion that the homœopaths "constitute an important and growing branch of the medical profession" is true only of certain localities where medical science is not in the most flourishing condition. Homœopathy is decidedly on the wane where scientific development is most active. We must content ourselves, in this note, with a simple reference to the status of homœopathy in Germany and in America in proof of our assertion. No one conversant with German

medical literature can deny that it is only the German homœopathic medical journals that are filled with selections from American medical literature, consisting almost wholly of loosely reported cases, while it is just as evident to every reader of English and American medical literature that much of our scientific material is copied from original articles published in German medical journals.

But it is not our purpose in this note to preach against homœopathy; we are contented with the better preaching which the facts are doing for us. We can see and appreciate the sophism of the "regular" who states that "no possible good could result from consultations in which there could by no possibility be an agreement." We recognize the fact that there is a radical difference between homœopath and regular in views as to drug-action only, and that drugging is but an insignificant part of modern therapeutics. We will go further in allowing that "nihilists" among the regulars and the "irregular" majority of the homœopaths may meet with every advantage which a consultation offers; but, after allowing all of this, we insist that there is a true principle of medical regularity which it is beneficial for the profession and the laity to recognize. (In parenthesis, we regret that this principle has been hidden to a great extent under senseless codes, and by laws created by the bigoted and prejudiced "stalwarts" of the regular profession.) This principle, in short, is that of allegiance to science, to truth as a whole. The regular physician must always consider members of an organization supporting any dogma or "pathy" as irregular. There is no need of debating as to the degree of error or of truth embodied in the dogma. If a given dogma were all true, it would not be all of the truth; and history teaches us that allegiance to a part of the truth even is liable to cause a dislike of other parts of the truth, especially if they apparently conflict. This position, then, of allegiance to a dogma is not favorable to that catholic love of, and ardent search for, truth which should characterize the medical man above all others. The foundation of our profession is science; the history of the progress of medicine is the history of the development of science. Humanity, including the laity, and the profession have been blessed together by this progress, so that the principles of a regular hold him to the highest good of every layman or unit of humanity.

This view we believe to be that of those reformers in New York who have repealed a law that interfered with individual rights of opinion. This action was not wild or visionary: it was merely a step toward following the precedent established by the most regular practitioners of Germany, of deciding for themselves with whom they will associate in matters of practice or trade. Their action marks the dawn of true medical liberalism in America. May we not hope that its day will shine upon a more united profession and a solid campaign of the educated physician against the uneducated—of the honest doctor against the quack?

Very respectfully yours,

DAVID HUNT.

Boston, Mass., June 17, 1882.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the last issue of the *Nation* there was an article upon the late action of the American Medical Association that, in some respects, did great injustice to the medical profession. That this should be so does not so much reflect upon the *Nation* as it indicates the general misapprehension of questions that are of fundamental importance in medicine. In the article the

word "allopathy" occurs as the proper designation of the practice of the great body of the profession. Now, there is no such thing as "allopathy," nor are there "allopaths." These terms, as applied to practice and to medical practitioners, are positive insults, just as much as infidel, atheist, pagan, etc., are when thrown at the leaders of modern thought. They are unwittingly used by the non-medical public; by the pathists of all sects they are deliberately shouted, to cover their own reputations. Worcester's Dictionary aids the imposture by defining "Allopathy" by an alleged quotation from the standard medical authority, Dunglison. The "quotation" is a deliberate falsification, absolutely misstating the authority. The 'British Encyclopædia' gives the following, which expresses the sentiment of the profession throughout civilization:

"Legitimate medicine is catholic and eclectic; it has neither exclusive dogmas nor creeds; it requires its members to seek knowledge from every available source, and apply it in every available mode as may be demanded by the circumstances of the practitioner or the patient; the object of the exercise of the art being the relief or cure of the patient as promptly, safely, and pleasantly as possible, without any formal restriction as to the means or mode."

There is no "pathy" of a certainty. The public will be immensely advantaged when its eyes are opened to this device of sectaries to throw the odium of dogma upon the medical profession.

The *Nation* finds the explanation of the hostility toward homœopaths, who are the most prominent sect, in professional jealousy. This is a common opinion, but none the less erroneous. When the New York State Society was punished by the National Medical Society, it was not because the former had attempted to do away with immaterial differences, but because it had desired to destroy a barrier that the profession had determinedly maintained for the protection of the public. We declare openly and positively that the practice of medicine, according to a dogma, is not only false, but dangerous; that while we freely acknowledge that the utmost of human knowledge is miserably deficient, we also assert that blind adherence to an undemonstrated principle must be disastrous as it is irrational (an assertion that on its face would seem superfluous, but human credulity appears to be unlimited in matters pertaining to medicine). Statutes being unavailing, to afford what protection it can to the public against quacks and sects, the profession has always refused to consult with "irregulars," and thereby remove all distinctions in the public eye. Many have been the covert attempts to break this fundamental and humane rule, but it has been reserved for the New York State Society to make the first open and organized attack upon it. Happily, New York itself promises to repudiate those who have thus betrayed it.

Very respectfully,

CHARLES A. TODD, M.D.,

Sec. Missouri State Medical Association.

St. Louis, June 20, 1882.

[The foregoing three letters largely answer each other. We must, however, point out to "S." that he denies nothing of consequence that we have asserted. He acknowledges that the regulars and homœopaths "differ as to a dogma," but says that the dogma belongs to the homœopaths, and is a poor article. We say nothing to the contrary. To our assertion that homœopathy has grown enormously, he opposes the assertions that one of its journals lately lamented that it was not growing at pre-

sent; that Spiritualism has grown here, but not in France or England; and that homœopathy is not recognized in German universities. To our remark that both bodies possess a high degree of skill, learning, and education, he answers that if "we would give ourselves the trouble to investigate 'the facts,' we should find that the average attainment was higher in the regular school." We think it is, but how does this conflict with our original statement? And where are "the facts"? Does "S." know where to find them? Has he ever investigated them himself? As to the value of the homœopaths as curers of disease, we take it that the public makes up its mind on this point precisely as it does on the value of the regulars, and there is no use in ascribing their success to popular ignorance or superstition. They are employed by all kinds and conditions of people—more, we think, by the educated than by the ignorant—and in every case the reason why they are employed is that the patient believes they cure disease. If this belief be destroyed, or weakened by experience, he discards them just as he would discard a regular and employ another. This is the hard fact of the matter. No degree or school does much for any doctor. No matter what a doctor calls himself, he gets the practice of people who pay fees solely by persuading them that they get well in his hands, and they cannot be argued out of their belief in him.—ED. NATION.]

POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE GOULDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me a word in behalf of some of the critics of that method of political economy which, as Mill says, assumes competition to be the exclusive regulator of its subject. Their views, as given in the recent article on the "Political Economy of Seventy-three Million Dollars" in the *Atlantic*, are not quite fairly treated when you translate them into the expression that "Gould's acquisition of his immense wealth is due to political economy, and political economy is all bosh." What they criticize is obviously not the study of the industrial welfare of man in society, but one method of that study; not the political economy of Maine, Laveleye, Cliffe Leslie, and Roscher, but that of Mill, his English followers, and their American imitators—the sect which glorifies self-interest, competition, and an imaginary freedom of contract. One who criticises Mormonism does not thereby declare that "religion is all bosh."

You say also that "Gould is the product of corrupt courts and legislatures, and no economist of any school ever taught that the principle of *laissez-faire* covered the right to bribe judges or gobble railroads, any more than it does the right to rob and murder on the highway." The class of corporation, trust, and stock-jobbers of which Mr. Gould is the most brilliant representative cannot be explained away on the "bad man" theory which the *Nation* has taught us to disbelieve in. Bad men we have with us always; but why have the "bad men" free course? A deeper cause than the depravity of individuals must account for the most dangerous fact of our social condition, the sudden development of a caste of overgrown wealth and power. If the theories of *laissez-faire* and exclusive regulation by competition do not permit these men to rob and murder by retail on the highway, they cause society to leave them to rob and murder by wholesale, by all kinds of "corners" and combinations, and by legal methods of oppress-

ing the people, betraying trusts, and deceiving the community. This class must be controlled, but they cannot be overcome by the political and industrial philosophy under which they have been suffered to grow up.

HENRY D. LLOYD.

CHICAGO, June 24, 1882.

[Who are "Mill's English followers and their American imitators—the sect which glorifies self-interest, competition, and an imaginary freedom of contract"? We know of no such persons or sect. Mill did not do these things himself, and it is therefore not likely that "his followers" do them. A few names of "the followers," and one or two of the "glorifying" passages from Mill, would be useful to Mr. Lloyd at this point. Mr. Lloyd denies our explanation of Gould, that he is "the product of corrupt courts and legislatures," and says that this is the "bad man" theory. But unfortunately it is in no respect distinguishable from Mr. Lloyd's own. He says that Gould is due to "society," which "leaves him to rob and murder by wholesale," besides "betraying trusts and deceiving the community." Of course society in this matter acts through corrupt courts and legislatures. Whenever a man robs and murders with impunity, and betrays trusts, it is because courts and legislatures do not do their duty; society has always prohibited robbery and murder and fraud. As to the cause of the neglect on the part of society, we shall not argue with Mr. Lloyd. If he thinks that it is "the *laissez-faire* theory" which makes it tolerate wholesale robbery and murder, he is welcome to his opinion. The ultimate cause of all human wickedness is an obscure subject, but it is one which does not concern economists or politicians, and we advise him to let it alone.—ED. NATION.]

LAND QUESTIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* of June 22 has editorially this: "The cause of the land troubles in Ireland has been for three hundred years that the tenure was not Irish but English"—the English system being "large landed proprietors living on rent," and the Irish system "the lands of the tribes held in a sort of commonalty with the chiefs."

Wherefore, unless I quite misunderstand the *Nation*, Mr. Davitt's "new Henry George, or Communistic, idea that the land is a great national domain," and Mr. Parnell's proposition "to lodge the ownership in the farmers"—600,000 of them, according to Mr. McCarthy—must be quite as much opposed to "Irish ideas" as even the present unsatisfactory "English" system.

Whose is the "Irish" idea of going back to the tribal system of "a sort of commonalty with the chiefs?" And who may be the chiefs?

I hope I am not unfairly straining the *Nation's* arguments; but I state fairly how they impress me, and respectfully ask for further enlightenment.

ANIT-LANDLORD.

[There is nobody who has "the Irish idea of going back to the system of a sort of commonalty with the chiefs." There are no chiefs. You do quite misunderstand the *Nation*. The "Irish idea," which has survived the tribes, the chiefs, and the commonalty, is that the tenant is part-owner of the soil with the legal owner of the fee, makes the needed improve-

ments in it, and has a right to stay on it as long as he pays a reasonable rent. This has been explained at least one hundred times during the past three years—about one thousand times during the past twenty-five years. The English idea is that the tenant hires a farm as he hires a town house, makes no improvements in it, and has no shred of title to it except what his lease gives. Henry George's idea is that neither landlord nor tenant, chief nor tribe, has any property in the soil whatever; that it all belongs to the state, which is to pay all its expenses by renting it.—ED. NATION.]

TOMB DISCOVERY NEAR CORINTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I find in the last number of the *Parnassos*, of Athens, the description of an ancient vaulted tomb with painted wall decoration, excavated recently near Corinth. This discovery is of considerable interest, as a tomb decorated in this manner has not, I believe, been discovered before in Greece proper—although, as is well known, tombs of similar character exist in great numbers in the Crimea, and to some extent, at least, in Lycia.

The tomb, according to the detailed report of the Ephor of Antiquities, Mr. P. Stamatakis, lies to the eastward of old Corinth, at the point commonly known as the Great Gate (Μεγάλη Πύλη). It was found upon the southern slope of a knoll, near its summit, by workmen engaged in building the carriage-road. Unfortunately, these men destroyed most of the vaulted ceiling of the tomb, and three of its sides with the paintings upon them, before their superiors interfered to save what remained—the northern side-wall, and some inconsiderable pieces of the other walls, with a part of the vault. The tomb was in the shape of a parallelogram; its length was 3.52 metres, and its breadth 2.92 metres. The surviving northern wall is 2.60 metres high, and about 65 centimetres thick. The walls of the tomb were built of rough stone and bricks or tiles, laid in mortar. Their inner surface was covered with cement, forming a smooth field for the paintings. Upon the surviving wall this field is divided, by lines, into four horizontal bands or zones, each one, after the first, being a little broader than the one above it. The upper band is divided by vertical lines into squares, in which are painted birds and bunches of grapes. The second zone, of which the decoration is the most elegant of all, presents, apparently, three different scenes, although these are not separated in any way from each other. The principal subject is that in the middle, which represents the funeral banquet—a subject commonly represented upon tombstones and upon ancient vases. About the table are several reclining figures, of which one is perhaps a general, for he wears a helmet. This man reclines supported on his left elbow; his body is naked as far as the middle, below which it is covered with white drapery. Upon the front part of the couch is seated a second figure, unclothed also, and barely distinguishable, but evidently taking no part in the banquet. Other figures can be made out indistinctly; their violent gestures seem to indicate that they are giving expression to grief. On the right-hand side of this scene can be made out with difficulty a large vase or other vessel, beside which are a woman and two men, of whom one rests one foot upon a sort of pedestal or bench. Upon the left-hand side are two other men in vigorous action, but to what end does not appear. All these figures are represented in a row much in the manner of those of a sculptured relief.

The third band contains three small niches, and in the spaces between the niches and at either end are four standing male figures wearing the chlamys. Three of these figures are in better preservation than any of the other paintings. Their height is about 35 centimetres. The drawing is well executed, and the color remains sufficiently fresh. In the fourth and lowest zone are represented various kinds of fruits and flowers in baskets, with birds eating the fruits or drinking water from other vessels.

The floor of the tomb is formed of a plain layer of cement. In the earth which had collected upon it were found abundant remains of human bones. Against the eastern wall of the interior was found the lower part of a sarcophagus of tufa, 2 metres in length, and 67 centimetres in width. Between the sarcophagus and the wall were discovered a number of fragments of a large glass vessel, and of lamps of burnt clay. Against the northern wall were found the remains of a similar sarcophagus. The tomb bears traces of having been rifled—most probably in ancient times, but possibly during the Middle Ages.

Immediately upon the announcement of this discovery, the Council of the Archaeological Society despatched to Corinth a painter to make accurate copies of the surviving frescoes. These copies have been made, it is said, with great care and exactness. They will be exhibited in the Museum of Antiquities at Athens. The paintings, according to the *Parnassos*, are characterized in a marked degree by harmony of coloring and excellence of design and execution. No conjecture as to the age of the monument appears in the article from which I quote. I think, however, that until we receive more exact information we can infer safely from the details given of the construction of the tomb and of the system of decoration employed, that it cannot date earlier than the Roman restoration of Corinth in the time of Julius Caesar.

I am, sir, very respectfully,

THOMAS W. LUDLOW.

COTTAGE LAWN, YONKERS, N. Y., June 21, 1882.

Notes.

S. C. GRIGGS & Co., Chicago, announce for speedy publication 'A System of Mental Philosophy,' by Professor Asa Mahan, ex-President of Oberlin College. It is designed as a text-book. Also, 'A Practical German Grammar,' by Professor W. C. Sawyer, of the St. Lawrence University, Wisconsin; and 'The Development of English Literature and Language,' by Professor A. H. Welsh.

Robert Clarke & Co., Cincinnati, will have ready in July 'Celebrated American Caverns, especially Mammoth, Wyandot, and Luray,' with maps and illustrations, by Horace C. Hovey. An appendix will contain a complete list of the subterranean fauna so far as known.

A. Williams & Co., Boston, have just published a third edition of Chief-Engineer King's 'Warships and Navies of the World'—an unmistakable tribute to the value of this important work. Already beyond the need of praise, it has received additions bringing it down to date, and the illustrations have been both increased and improved.

No. 23 of the Professional Papers of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., consists of Lieutenant-Colonel Henry L. Abbot's report on experiments toward a system of submarine mines for harbor defence. Diagrams and instantaneous and other photographs illustrate this work in a way to make it attractive even to the general reader, who is certainly concerned in the result of the experiments.

Among the various topics of the Report of the Chief of Ordnance for the year 1881 are the Spencer line-throwing gun and the Hunt life-saving projectile. On pp. 370-375 is a noticeable list of synonymous terms in English, French, and German relating to filing, file-cutting, files, and rasps. Favorable scientific reviews of Captain Dutton's report on the geology of the high plateaus of Utah are quoted on pp. 173-184.

We have received the twenty-ninth volume of *Lippincott's Magazine*, which calls for no remark unless it be in commendation of the typographical neatness of this periodical, and of the illustrations as compared with those of earlier volumes.

Vol. ii. of the *Dial* (Chicago: Jansen, McClurg & Co.) marks the hold on life and on popular favor which this "monthly index of current literature" has deservedly obtained at the West.

'The Mother's Record' (Boston: D. Lothrop & Co.) is not quite "unique," as the publishers allege. It differs from the 'Mother's Register' (*Levret Maternel*) of Dr. J. B. Fossagrives in being confined to the first fifteen years of childhood, and in being an unscientific tabulation of "physical, mental, and moral growth." It is useful as far as it goes, and will measurably serve as a help to the physician as well as to the youth who forms the subject of the record, when he endeavors to know himself. The arrangement by years instead of by topics, as weight, growth, teeth, etc., is unfavorable to comparisons and general views. The book is prettily made.

'The Last Years of the Roman Republic' and 'University Education in Germany' are bibliographically treated in the June number of the Providence Public Library's *Monthly Reference Lists*.

In emulation of the *Privat-Dozent* system of the German universities, the Trustees of Columbia College have established three prize lectureships in the School of Political Science. The designated lecturers must be graduates either from the above School or from the College Law School. They will hold office for three years and be reëligible. For twenty lectures per annum they will receive \$500. The appointments are to begin in June, 1883. The expectation is that these lectureships "will tend to raise up a body of trained, educated, and competent instructors," fitted to supply vacancies in faculties of the historical and political sciences.

The second annual announcement of the School of Political Science in the University of Michigan states that the scope of the school will be enlarged during the coming year so as to include instruction in the principles of finance, in the financial history of the United States, in the history of diplomacy, in the history of political ideas, in methods of local government, in theories and methods of taxation, in political ethics, in social science, in the historical development of educational systems, in the economic development of mineral resources, and in public scientific surveys.

Dr. Charles Waldstein, a graduate of Columbia College and native of this city, has just received the honorary degree of Master of Arts from the University of Cambridge, England, where for two years he has been the lecturer on Greek art and archaeology, with eminent success.

A Concord (N. H.) magazine with which we tardily make acquaintance, as it is already in its fifth volume, is called the *Granite Monthly*, and is "devoted to Literature, History, and State Progress." Its main feature is a steel portrait of some New Hampshire worthy, accompanied by a biographical sketch; but in other ways, also, it serves as an historical medium, and is interesting if unpretentious reading.

A paper read before the Philadelphia Social

Science Association on June 1, by Mr. Addison B. Burk, has just been published by the Association. It treats of "Apprenticeship as it Was and Is," and is noteworthy for its computation as to the number of mechanics among our country and city population respectively—nearly three to one in favor of the former; and for its revelations as to the greater prevalence of apprenticeships, even of the indentured kind, than is commonly believed. Mr. Burk does not think our modern conditions compatible with a revival of the system, and his paper recommends industrial schools in the place of it.

Students of the perpetual conflict between man and nature will find something to their account in Dr. E. Reyer's paper on changes in the alluvial districts of Venetia and Tuscany in the historic period, printed in No. 98 of the Berlin Geographical Society's *Zeitschrift*, with bibliographical references. Dr. R. Kiepert catalogues and criticises the African cartography of the past year. The principal map of the number defines, on a liberal scale, the military border between Chile and the Argentine Confederation, at the head-waters of the Rivers Colorado and Neuquen, as surveyed by two officers of the latter nation and described in a translation.

Le Livre for June is more than usually rich in full-page illustrations, one of which is from the album of designs by Victor Hugo, recently privately printed by his friends. It represents the wreck in the 'Travailleurs de la Mer,' and, like fifty others of the designs, originally decorated the MS. of this romance. Among the leading articles, Champfleury satirizes the dramatic sins of Charles Nodier. A second instalment of Paul Lacroix's unpublished memoirs continues the account of Balzac, whose egotism is now the theme, and concludes with Balzac's *critique*, or rather *éloge*, of his own 'Physiologie du Mariage,' prepared by him for the *Mercur du XIXe. Siècle*, where it was printed verbatim. *Le Livre* announces that a 'History of the Life and Writings of J. J. Rousseau,' in French, by A. Jansen, is in preparation, and that Ruggero Bonghi is engaged upon an edition of the unpublished works and letters of Manzoni.

The French publishers' *Chronique* records a contract for 10,000 copies of Michelet's 'Histoire de France,' and 'Histoire de la Révolution Française,' with illustrations by Vierge, market value 1,960,000 francs, and, contrasting this with the small number printed of the first editions of these works, draws favorable conclusions as to the present historical taste of the French.

—*Lippincott's* for July opens with an article on "Black-Bass-Fishing in Sungahneetuck," by Mr. Rowland E. Robinson; and it has also an article on "Shark-Fishing off the Florida Coast," where the sport appears to involve considerable risk, and to be certainly productive of much excitement. According to a humorous negro quoted by the writer, Mr. C. F. Holder, a "right smart business in sherk-oil" is done along the coast. What use the oil is put to is a secret of the trade; it is one which the Northern invalid who goes to Florida in search of health may be interested in, if the statements of old Alick on the subject are to be credited: "Dis yer sherk-oil goes to Jacksonville, dat's sartin sho', an' dey say dere's a right smart call fo' cod-liber oil on account of dese yer invalids a-flockin' dere. Jes' where de oil goes, I can't say: you can draw yo' own influence." The stories and poems which fill up the number are not so noticeable as the dastardly attack on the "Mt. Desert girl" in the "Monthly Gossip." The writer of this, who is evidently a woman, declares that in the many studies of the American girl which have been given us of late, one of her most marked traits has been wholly

omitted, and that is, her "indifference to the beauty of nature." For instance, at Mt. Desert, where "there is beauty of natural scenery enough to satisfy the most exacting," what do the girls occupy themselves with? They become, it seems, either "piazza girls," or "jolly girls," or "cottage swells"—names sufficiently descriptive to make further definition unnecessary. Of real knowledge of, or interest in, nature, not a trace is to be found. But few have the slightest acquaintance with botany, beyond the names of "a few hot-house and garden flowers"; and the writer gives a shocking instance of this ignorance by telling of an "enthusiastic botanist" who brought to one of the hotels a specimen of the common sun-dew: "The astonishment of the feminine element, old and young, was extreme and unfeigned; they had never heard of insectivorous plants." Many an illusion has been torn from us since the war, but we still cling to the idea that the American girl could tell an insectivorous plant as far as she could see it. The contrary may be true, but should it be told? The reputation of the American girl has stood the test of foreign criticism better, perhaps, than that of any other American institution, and we had rather cherish the pleasing fancy that piazza girls and jolly girls, or even cottage swells, knew as much of botany as they ought to, than to have their ignorance exposed in this rude manner.

—Our degraded fellow-citizens in Alaska, known as the Thlinkits, are described together with their country by Mr. C. E. S. Wood in the *July Century*. They are, in spite of their vices, interesting objects of study: their marriages are determined by the totemic system, and their manufactures exhibit genuine artistic capacity. Rugs of their weaving are occasionally to be met with here at the East, resembling in pattern the chief's cloak pictured on p. 330. Examined closely, the ornamentation here will be seen to be derived from the human face in a manner exactly analogous to that employed by the Peruvians, as evidenced by the mummy-cloths from Ancon. Mr. Benjamin's entertaining paper on "The Evolution of the American Yacht" is complementary to that in the current *Harper's* on the old race of New York shipbuilders. Portraits of Eckford and George Steers may be compared in both magazines. Col. Waring gives a précis, with the aid of cuts, of Stillman's 'Horse in Motion,' and adds some judicious criticism. In regard to the artistic representation of the animal, he concludes that "we must see him on the canvas as we see him in life, not as he is shown when his movements are divided by the five-thousandth part of a second." At the same time, he admits that long familiarity with these instantaneous views has made some of them very satisfactory expressions of motion. Mr. John Burroughs has a long and sympathetic article on Thoreau, of whom a likeness is given. Mr. Burroughs notices that the hermit of Walden Pond, though ever watchful of Nature, possessed but imperfectly the naturalist's vision. "He was looking too intently for a bird behind the bird—for a mythology to shine through his ornithology." The editor and Miss Emma Lazarus have each something to say about Thoreau's greater townsman, just departed; Mr. Kruell, too, speaks forcibly with his graver, following French's bust of Emerson.

—The 'Constitution and Membership' of the National Academy of Sciences, recently issued by the Home Secretary, Washington, shows that there were, at the close of the late meeting, April 21, 1882, ninety-six ordinary members (of whom three, General Barnard, Admiral John Rodgers, and Professor William B. Rogers, have since died), four honorary members, thirty-five

deceased members, and twenty-one foreign associates of the Academy (of which latter twelve are deceased). By the original act of incorporation, approved in 1863, the Academy consists of not more than fifty ordinary members, but this act was so amended in 1870 as to remove the limitation of the number of ordinary members. The membership is, however, by the constitution of the Academy, restricted in effect to one hundred. Of the meetings of the Academy, there are two annually: one stated session in Washington, on the third Tuesday of April, and another at such place and time as the Council may determine—usually held in the month of November, in either New York or Philadelphia. It being the duty of the Academy, in compliance with the act of its incorporation, to "investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of science or art," whenever called upon by any department of the Government, a number of committees have been appointed, those of more general interest at present in force being (1) to confer with the honorable Secretary of the Interior on the subject of reserving portions of the public lands on and near Mount Whitney, California, for scientific purposes; (2) to confer with the Chief Signal Officer on questions of meteorological science and its applications; (3) to report on the Coast Survey Triangulation to connect the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; (4) to cooperate with the National Board of Health. The organization of the Academy is as follows: President, William B. Rogers; Vice-President, O. C. Marsh; Foreign Secretary, Alex. Agassiz; Home Secretary, S. Newcomb; Treasurer, J. H. C. Coffin.

—A correspondent writes us from Ann Arbor as follows, concerning the production, on Saturday evening, June 17, of Terence's "Adelphi" by the students of the University of Michigan:

"The first Latin play ever given in America," as the handbills announced it, was listened to by an interested audience, and received almost with enthusiasm. Love of novelty, and local pride, no doubt, partially explain the marked success of the evening; but no competent and impartial judge could fail to recognize the genuine dramatic excellence of the performance. It was given under the supervision of Mr. C. M. Gayley, instructor in Latin in the University, and to him most of the credit is due, aside from the acting itself. He had received suggestions in regard to the scenery, the costumes, etc., from the Head Master of Westminster School, in England, where it has been the custom for many years to give a play of Terence annually. The details, of course, had to be worked out alone, and the great pains taken, even in minute particulars, were rewarded by admirable stage effects. The stage was as faithful a reproduction of the ancient stage as was possible under the circumstances—every one was ready to overlook the two or three intentional anachronisms brought in for the sake of perspicuity; the costumes were accurate in design, worn with ease, and so chosen as to form harmonious effects in color when grouped upon the stage. The greatest surprise for the spectators, however, came from seeing genuine acting. There had been no attempt at *réclame*, and the audience expected generally a cold and probably correct recitation of the Latin, which would be intelligible only by the aid of Colman's rather free translation printed opposite the text in the libretto. Warmth and naturalness of delivery, and a proper attention to stage 'business,' were, on the contrary, the results of the pains taken with the young men. *Demea*, the most difficult and important part, was probably, upon the whole, best given, though *Micio* certainly was not far behind. The scenes between the two brothers in the first and fifth acts—which, taken together, illustrate so well Lessing's requirement that contrast of character in comedy should arise solely from the accentuation of previously existing differences—were admirably given. *Syrus*, the confidential and tricky slave, was probably the most successful part with the audience generally, and certainly there was an abundance of comic force, an endless supply of knavish good spirits and ingenuity. But his 'make-up' was faulty: a slave who could speak of holding *Æschinus* and *Ctesipho* in his arms when babies should not have ap-

peared a handsome youth of nineteen. *Sostrata* did what she had to do excellently, and the buxom matron deservedly won the favor of the audience. Almost the only criticism of the performance was that some parts were overdone. This was certainly true according to our taste nowadays; but it is doubtful if Cicero, who seems to quote with approval a reproach addressed to Calidius, that there was *nulla suppositio pedis* while he was pleading, would have thought this criticism well founded. A juster criticism could perhaps be made of the apparent attempt to reconcile the retention of the Terentian metres with the supposed requirements of a popular audience to-day. The performance will probably be repeated in the autumn, and possibly be given then in Detroit as well as in Ann Arbor.

—One can imagine the surprise of the Hon. Jay Hubbell on taking up the *Strict-Constructionist*, a Boston "Evening Daily devoted to Civil-Service Reform," of which the first number appeared on June 22. There is no association behind it, no syndicate, apparently no capitalist. Of its conductors all that can be learned from its pages is that "every writer engaged on this paper is a Harvard graduate." Concerning its principles there is no mystery or obscurity:

"The business habits of officeholders are of more importance than their opinions are. This doctrine supersedes altogether what the Stalwarts understand by politics, or, rather, what they wish their dupes to understand; and, so far as it prevails, it will take the ground away from under the Machines. Civil-service reforms should be advocated by specific measures instead of by high-sounding declarations which do not bind the one who makes them to any efficient action."

Mr. Hubbell will not fail to discover other damnable heresies in this remarkably outspoken sheet. We cite further two or three paragraphs from the negative column entitled "The News":

"Postmaster Pearson, of New York, although his promotion was a flagrant violation of the principles of Civil-Service Corruption, has not yet been removed to make room for a manager of votes."

"The Speaker of the House has not yet done the expelled stenographers the justice of informing the public what was the cause for which he so suddenly took away their employment, and branded them as unfaithful."

"Since the Lamson affair, there has been no fresh interference by our Government with the course of justice in England."

For the rest, the *Strict-Constructionist* is as original in its make-up as it is independent and pithy in the expression of its sentiments.

—The death of Joseph Lemuel Chester in London, on May 26, removed the acknowledged head of English genealogists. It should be a matter of pride that Col. Chester was an American, born April 30, 1821, at Norwich, Conn., and that he was almost as well informed in American family history as he was in English. The first thirty-five years of his life were spent here, and he attained some little reputation as a writer, publishing a volume of poems under the title of "Greenwood." Not long before the Rebellion he went to England, desiring to verify the traditional descent of his family, in common with many others in New England, from John Rogers, the protomartyr. Although his researches completely destroyed the fond illusion, he became deeply interested in the subject of the life and work of that great pioneer in religious liberty, and the result was a volume of 452 pages, printed in 1861 by Longmans. The book attracted much attention in England, not only from the interest felt in the subject-matter, but on account of the method of its treatment. Not only was it exhaustive, but the wealth of the manuscript collections preserved in the mother country was shown in a most attractive form. Colonel Chester continued to reside in England, and from the taste of the delights of genealogical study thus received, he became a confirmed and enthusiastic genealogist.

He acquired a perfect mastery of the handwriting of the last six centuries, and he devoted his time to an exploration of those vast accumulations of documents still preserved in the State Paper Office, the Universities, the Will Offices, and the church registers. He sought no other pleasures, but wrought on, year after year, giving often sixteen hours a day to his labor. He was a rapid penman, and his elegant chirography brought many welcome bits of information to his correspondents here. Of course, he made many special hunts for the English origin of many of our settlers; but, besides that, he scrupulously and systematically collected every item that affected any of the emigrants to this country in the seventeenth century. His most noted work in this direction was in regard to the Washington family, whereby he destroyed the idle guesses of Sir Isaac Heard, without, to his regret, being able to supply the true pedigree. At one time he examined, copied, and indexed some forty thousand of the matriculations at Oxford; at another he copied, annotated, and published the registers of Westminster Abbey—glorious contributions to the history of the land of his adoption.

—It was not long before Colonel Chester's labor was appreciated. As an American he was allowed privileges, in the way of access to private papers, which an Englishman would not have enjoyed. But beyond that, he carried to his work an enthusiasm and fidelity which had been long wanting in English antiquaries. He relied but little on printed works. He did not copy the fables of successive peerages or county histories, but sought the facts from contemporary records. He was the acknowledged leader of the new school of investigators, and inspired his followers with his own impatience of error. He was, moreover, imbued with that spirit of order and attention to details which made our best American genealogies the wonder of our English friends. That he did not print more is a great misfortune, especially to his reputation; but his great collections, carefully arranged and indexed as he kept them, will be a lasting monument to him. Colonel Chester was naturally a member of many historical societies, both here and abroad, and at least one college had honored him with a degree. He was a model correspondent—prompt, intelligent, and sympathetic. It is to be regretted that no statement can easily be made of the amount of valuable antiquarian results thus communicated by him to his friends throughout the country. He married, in 1839, Catherine H. H. Shepherd, and had one son and three daughters. We are under the impression that he lost some portion of his family before his own decease; but the survivors can feel assured that his name will be long remembered, and will always stand high on the roll of earnest and successful students. He was an honor to his country, and we vainly look for his successor.

—Since the law against the Socialists came into force in Germany over 700 Social-Democratic publications have been prohibited. Their names were published, as the law requires, in the *Reichs-Anzeiger*; but as the publication was spread over a considerable time, it was very difficult for an officer of the Government to ascertain whether any given Socialist tract which he found circulating in his district had been forbidden or not. The President of the Department of Police has therefore caused an alphabetical index to be made reaching to March 1. This new *Index librorum prohibitorum* is to be distributed to all Police, Custom-house, Revenue, and Post-office employees, and will probably prove as effectual in extirpating Social-Democratic doctrines as the

Index of the Romish Church has been in suppressing Protestantism and other heresy.

—Of writing many (lists of) books there is no end. Even the no doubt important, but to the vast majority of mankind entirely uninteresting, subject of notaryship has not only its bibliography but bibliographies. The first of these, by Korndörffer, a librarian, appeared in 1875 in a Dutch periodical, *Regt en Wet*; it enumerated 724 works. The next year another librarian, Torres Campos, wrote his 'Estudios de Bibliografía Española y Extranjera del Derecho y del Notariado.' Finally, Dr. Vladimir Pappafava, in his 'Delle Opere che Illustrarono il Notariato,' published at Zora in Dalmatia, has collected more than 500 titles in Italian, French, Spanish, Dutch, Russian, and other languages, with occasional notes. Perhaps, after all, the notarial art is not a less suitable stimulus to the industry of the book-recorder than the civil law, fossil insects, Italian geology, the evolutionary theory, electricity, angling, perfumery, Freemasonry, copyright, shorthand, the pamphlets of the French romantic school, microscopic editions, and lost books, all of which have been issued in the last nine months, to say nothing of the numerous personal bibliographies—Mai, Browning, Dickens, Thackeray, Tennyson, Carlyle, Ruskin, and the many shorter lists that have not attained an independent existence, but have appeared within the covers of some periodical like the *Literary World*, the *Library Journal*, *Il Bibliofilo*, the *Neuer Anzeiger*, or in the columns of a journal or the pages of a book devoted to the subject of which the bibliography treated. The materials for the "universal bibliography," of which certain English scholars are continually and unavailingly talking, are accumulating. Has any library had the thought of getting together all these fugitive subject-bibliographies, and so making a universal bibliography, for its own use, at least? We doubt it. There is no trace of any such idea in the list of bibliographies lately issued by the British Museum. If the best library in the world has not done it, it is not likely that any other has. And yet it would require only a little money, and some watchfulness.

—Financial success did not attend Director Neumann's first experiments with Wagner's Tetralogy in London. He made the mistake of charging too high admission prices—almost double the amount asked at the Italian Operas, which have always been famous for their exorbitance. That this was the principal reason is proved by the fact that when, at the end of the regular cycles, extra performances were given of the "Walküre" and "Götterdämmerung" at reduced prices the house was crowded to the roof. Richter, who directed another series, including Wagner's early operas as well as the "Meistersinger," "Tristan and Isolde," Weber's "Euryanthe," and Beethoven's "Fidelio," for which he charged more moderate prices, has, on the contrary, been very successful. All the critics, even the most hostile, bestow the most unqualified praise on "Die Meistersinger," which the *Athenæum* thinks will ultimately prove the most popular of all his works. Even the *Telegraph* admits that "there is hardly a dull bar in the opera." The choruses are the most difficult ones ever written in an opera, but they were superbly sung by the Hamburg choristers, showing Londoners, by their own admission, for the first time what good operatic chorus singing is. The *Academy* says: "The score is anything but noisy; it is full of the most delicate effects, rich combinations, marked and wonderful contrasts. Wagner shows at times in his orchestration the grace of a Mozart, the grandeur of a Beethoven, and the ingenuity of a Berlioz." *Truth* says: "I have nothing but praise

for 'Meistersinger.' Wagner was quite right—it was bound to take the English people." The *World* remarks: "At every new performance the audience leaves delighted, and, the natural consequence being that they send other audiences in, the future of German opera in this country seems to have a much more brilliant chance than it ever had before. To the English public the 'Meistersinger' is a revelation: . . . music sometimes for forty minutes without brass—full of melody, chorus, and concerted music—music not only learned and a most interesting study of counterpoint, handled with an ease delightful to behold, but music amusing to make you roar. The whole house burst out laughing at that mock serenade and at the competition of the singers." The *St. James's Gazette* says: "Wagner is master of every mood. He was already known by his critical writings as a keen satirist; and his mediæval comic opera shows him to be as rich in the humor of every-day life as in the more spiritual qualities to which the beauty of his music is chiefly due." This list might be indefinitely extended. It shows that if an attempt is to be made in this country to produce an example of Wagner's latest and best style, it should be "Die Meistersinger."

—Joseph Joachim Raff, whose death was announced by cable on Monday, was born at Lachen, on the Lake of Zürich, on May 27, 1822. His early years were a continual struggle against poverty, which compelled him to abandon his studies and devote himself to teaching, without, however, neglecting music. Through the medium of some MS. compositions he became acquainted with Mendelssohn, who recommended him to the publishing house of Breitkopf & Härtel. In 1846 Mendelssohn invited him to come to Leipzig and become his pupil. The proposal was accepted, but before it could be carried out Mendelssohn died. The same ill luck attended him later when Liszt, who had already done him other favors, gave him a letter to the publisher Marchetti in Vienna. While en route for that city Raff heard of Marchetti's death, which induced him to remain in Stuttgart, where he devoted himself to composition and practice on the piano and violin, with the object of becoming a virtuoso. His efforts to secure a public performance of his works failed, owing to the hostility of the conservative Lindpainter, who was then in power in that city. Finally Hans von Bülow came to his rescue and paved the way for the popularity which his works at present enjoy. Raff's merits were at once recognized by Schumann, who had "discovered" so many composers and heralded them as rising stars. At a later date Raff was a contributor to the journal founded by Schumann, the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*. In a brochure on the "Wagner question" he came forward as an enthusiastic advocate of the new tendencies in music, the strong influence of which on his own compositions is everywhere apparent. He wrote three operas, one of which, "König Alfred," is still occasionally performed at Stuttgart, although none of them has ever obtained a general success. Of his ten symphonies several are well known in this country, especially the third ("Im Walde") and the fifth ("Lenore"). His list of works is of formidable length, embracing over 200 compositions in almost every branch of his art, but including also many paraphrases of other composers' works. Among the orchestral composers of the day Raff might be ranked as the sixth after Wagner, Rubinstein, Liszt, Saint-Saëns, and Brahms. Some of his works are, in melodic and harmonic invention, of first-class merit, but the form of his longer compositions is often as clumsy, unpolished, and

unsymmetrical as the style of Kant and Jean Paul, and many of his movements are flimsy and vulgar. The first and the slow movements of his complicated compositions are almost invariably the best. Over-productiveness, diffuseness, and lack of self-criticism were the three faults which prevented Raff from taking the highest rank among composers. At the time of his death he was director of the Frankfort Conservatory of Music.

PERRY'S HISTORY OF GREEK AND ROMAN SCULPTURE.

Greek and Roman Sculpture: A Popular Introduction to the History of Greek and Roman Sculpture. By Walter Copland Perry. With 268 illustrations on wood. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1882. Square 8vo, pp. xxx.-700.

THIS is a useful book, which supplies a need that has been distinctly felt. The progress of knowledge in respect to antiquity during the last fifty years has hardly been more rapid or more interesting in any branch of archaeology than in that of ancient art. Not only has the knowledge of facts been immensely extended and increased, but the illustration afforded by the fine arts of the life and thought of the ancient world has become so vivid, precise, and comprehensive as to compel the recognition of the importance of their history to the proper understanding of the nature and development of the civilization of the Old World. It is, indeed, only of late that their full significance as the most intimate and trustworthy expressions of human character and dispositions has become apparent to students of history. The fact is not even yet admitted by such thinkers as are attached to traditional modes of investigation. English students especially have been slow in acknowledging the just claims of the arts as not only great social powers, but still more as the means by which the surest judgment could be formed concerning the moral and social conditions of a race. Mill was perhaps the only great English thinker of the last generation who fully comprehended their importance. Grote could write his 'History of Greece' and pay but the scantiest attention to the most brilliant manifestation of Greek genius. And the recognition that the arts hold an equally important place with philosophy and science as agents of civilization, and that Greek history in particular cannot be correctly apprehended or interpreted without a knowledge of Greek art, is still so imperfect that Mr. Perry himself, though he writes the 'History of Greek Sculpture,' fails to grasp this conception vigorously, and fails, consequently, to secure for his work its highest interest as a record of the productions in which the sentiment and emotions of the noblest race of men the world has seen found one of their most beautiful and most instructive expressions. He treats his subject for the most part with little reference to the course of events of general history; and though it is impossible to overlook the relation between the incidents of Greek history in the fifth century B.C. and the splendor of the arts, he does not exhibit their mutual dependence in such a way as to bring out its real nature.

This is the main defect of a book otherwise distinguished by ample acquaintance with the subject, by good judgment, by sensible criticism, and a clear and unpretending style. As a compend of correct information concerning the sculptors and the sculpture of Greece and Rome, it deserves very hearty praise. The contrast between it and Mr. A. S. Murray's pretentious and inaccurate 'History of Greek Sculpture' is striking. The student who desires to know what is known about the topic can have no better book

of reference. It is an excellent hand-book, opening the way to the study of the more elaborate and original works of German investigators, such as Brunn, Overbeck, and Michaelis.

Although Mr. Perry's remarks are generally judicious, he occasionally lays himself open to adverse criticism. What he says, for example (pp. 442-43), in speaking of Praxiteles as the sculptor of women, concerning the position and character of Athenian women, shows that he, student as he is of ancient sculpture, has missed the instruction which it affords in respect to this very matter. He fails, like most writers upon the subject, to make the discrimination of time which is essential in judging of the place held by woman and the character achieved by her at Athens. In a sentence that displays a curious confusion he says: "The aristocratic bearing of many female statues proves the reality of the high position of women at an early period, and these have their parallels in the Calypsos and Circes of poetry. A great change for the worse, therefore, and one for which it is difficult to account, must have taken place between the heroic and historic ages." Now, Mr. Perry certainly cannot mean that these statues which prove the reality of the high position of women were works of the heroic age, nor can he suppose that the Calypsos and Circes of poetry are types of women of high character. He is plainly writing without thought. The first statue of a woman, in which individual characteristics were sharply defined—the first, at least, concerning which we have direct testimony—was the so-called Sosandra of Calamis, which stood on the Acropolis at Athens, and of which Lucian has described the delightful traits. His ideal figure, created of every statue's best, was to have the modesty of Sosandra, her grave and hidden smile, her orderly and becoming dress. These few words tell much. But it was for Phidias, in the generation after Calamis, to give to us innumerable portraits of the maidens and matrons of Athens which afford testimony absolutely incontrovertible to the grace, the charm, the dignity, the elevation of Athenian women, while he set these women in such position as to show their equality with the men who represented the highest development the race has attained. Even if this convincing testimony were wanting, it would be absurd to believe that the women of Athens were morally far inferior to the men. It is contrary to nature that there should be a wide moral disparity between men and women of one generation. The men who made Athens the mother and gracious nurse of the arts, "the most shining city of all upon which Zeus looks," came of no inferior mothers, and were wedded to no unloved or unworthy wives. In the Pan-Athenaic procession those mothers and wives appear before us in their living forms—forms and features the evidence of character which has impressed its image on those "faultless productions," as Shelley calls them, "whose very fragments are the despair of modern art, and has propagated impulses which cannot cease to ennoble and delight mankind until the extinction of the race." Sophocles, and even Euripides, but confirm the evidence of Phidias. Is the character of Antigone drawn from a low source? or that of Alcestis?

It may be said that these are all ideal representations; but how often must it be repeated that all true ideals are drawn from nature, and only through their accordance with nature possess their life and exert their influence? Beauty, nobility, excellence of whatever sort, must be realized in life before it can be expressed in art. The position of woman declined with the decline of Athens. Her character sank as the character of the men of Athens grew lower and lower. The figures of Praxiteles are not of the same virtue as those of Phidias. But even in the

period of decline Niobe and her daughters show us how much loftiness and loveliness were still retained by the women of Greece.

Mr. Perry's book contains an excellent account of the recent discoveries at Olympia and Pergamon; and the information on these and other subjects is well up to date. In a new edition, which must speedily be called for, the remarkable additions which have been made to our knowledge of archaic sculpture by the expedition to Assos of the Archaeological Institute of America will demand notice. A careful revision of some minor details is requisite. On page 312, for "Lapith" read Athenian; page 346, note 1, the citation ascribed to Pausanias should be ascribed to Strabo viii., 372; page 356, note 5, the reference to Plutarch should be not to *Quest. Convic.*, but to *de Profect. in Virt.* 17; page 493, for 375,000 l. read 305,500 l.; page 511, line 2, for "cella" read opisthodomos; page 516, line 8, for "beginning" read end; page 567, for "Aule Metelli" read Aulus Metellus. There are too many such small errors, and especially in the changing of Olympiads into the years a.c. to which they correspond the mistakes are numerous and annoying.

PULSZKY'S MEMOIRS.

Életem és korom [My Life and My Time]. By Francis Pulszky. Vol. iii. Buda-Pesth. (German ed., Presburg.) 1882.

THIRTY years ago, on April 27, 1852, the defeated chief of the Hungarian revolution, Louis Kossuth, made what may be called a triumphal entry into Boston. It was a grand day for all New England, and a bright day in the checkered life of the now octogenarian exile, the fiftieth anniversary of whose birth it happened to be. Most noticeable among his Hungarian companions were Francis Pulszky, in this country as well as in England called by courtesy Count Pulszky, and his wife. The latter was already at that time known as an English authoress, having published in London 'Memoirs of an Hungarian Lady' and 'Tales and Traditions of Hungary.' Her husband was no less proficient in English, and his free conversation in that language was admired even by those who had listened to the addresses of the ex-Governor of Hungary. An object of still greater admiration was the vast store of his encyclopedic knowledge. History, languages, ethnology, and archaeology were his favorite studies. He and his gifted wife had an ample share in the ovations bestowed on Kossuth throughout his American tour. On his return from New England to New York, he found, among other papers received by mail, a number of the official gazette of Vienna, which contained the sentence passed on him, *in contumaciam*, by the military tribunal of Austria, for acts committed in furtherance of the cause of the Hungarian revolution in the two preceding years. He had been condemned to the gallows, and his estates confiscated. Returning to England, where he coöperated with Kossuth in all his endeavors in the Hungarian cause, he sustained himself and his family by diligent contributions, political and literary, to the British and foreign press, including the *New York Tribune*, for which, for a number of years, he wrote a weekly letter on "The State of Europe," remarkable for accurate information on affairs in the eastern parts of that continent.

During this period the Pulszkys were in constant friendly or political communication with Mazzini, Louis Blanc, Ruge, and other leading exiles from all parts of Europe, but at the same time also enjoyed an extensive intercourse with the higher classes of London society, noble or learned, such as the British metropolis rarely

accords to foreigners. Kossuth's attempt to revive Hungarian independence by an alliance with Napoleon III. and Cavour in 1859 caused Pulszky to follow the ex-Governor to Italy, which, after the collapse of their hopes by the peace of Villafranca, became the home of both—Kossuth to this day residing in Turin. Pulszky, however, after partaking in Garibaldi's venture of 1862, which caused him to be arrested in Naples, turned toward less revolutionary paths, entered into an understanding with Hungary's great parliamentarian, Deák, and in 1866 was allowed by the Austrian Government to go to Buda, where his wife and daughter were lying sick, having gone there for the recovery of the family's estates. On his arrival he found both dead, and not many days later one of his sons followed them to the grave. The bereaved exile now remained in his fatherland, and the re-establishment of the Hungarian constitution in the following year restored him to ease and honor. He became again a member of the Hungarian Diet, in 1869 director of the National Museum at Pesth, and in 1872 superintendent-general of the public libraries and galleries of the kingdom, which latter two positions he still holds. In 1879 he began the publication, in Magyar and German, of his memoirs, the third part of which is now before us. His tour through the United States he had previously described, jointly with his wife, in 'White, Red, and Black' (3 vols., London, 1852).

Patriotic, liberal, and learned, Pulszky has nevertheless been an easy-going revolutionist, politician, and writer. His memoirs are much more remarkable for breadth and correctness than for keenness of observation or depth of reflection. He talks pleasantly on a great variety of things seen in his country and abroad, on a vast number of persons eminent in modern history and literature with whom he has come in contact, and he adds interesting lines to the already extant pictures of those things and men. But he shuns the labor of analysis, is too kindly disposed to indulge in piquant revelations of foibles or hidden springs of action, is too thankful for humane attentions experienced in exile life to attempt incisive delineations of foreign manners, and altogether too much bent on imparting plain, sound information to his countrymen not to make his narratives occasionally commonplace. On the other hand, he is never dull, he passes rapidly from topic to topic, and his anecdotes are often both amusing and characteristic. American readers not sufficiently versed in Hungarian history to be interested in the minor details of its later periods, will find the third volume, which is devoted to the author's days of exile in England and America, and forms a separate whole, well worth reading. The chapters descriptive of men and things in the former country are much richer, because based on much longer experience and wider associations, than those filled with reminiscences of the United States; but the latter sections are specially interesting as combining impressions received by a liberal although charitably disposed foreigner in the palmy days of pro-slavery reaction, with reflections matured after the downfall of the slave system and a wonderful expansion of the Union's power among the nations of the earth.

Some of Pulszky's remarks appear almost naïve in their (so to say) antediluvian coloring; others serve to complete, however slightly, our knowledge of the conditions and men of that time. It is interesting, for instance, to read how both Seward and Sumner advised Kossuth never to touch the question of slavery in his speeches, in the North or South alike; how an unfavorable current set in against Kossuth's republican agitation, chiefly in Democratic quar-

ters, on receipt of the news of Louis Napoleon's successful *coup d'état*, because of speculations unfavorable to England based upon that event; how in Boston, in spite of the fierce divisions created by the slavery agitation between its leading families, all shades of opinion vied with each other in honoring the eloquent Hungarian chief, while of all the cities of the South, New Orleans alone had the political courage to invite him as its guest; with what noble oratory Winthrop combated the Magyar's pleading for American intervention in behalf of the downtrodden nations of Europe; or how—some years later, in London—the subsequently notorious Saunders, American consul, tried to bring about an understanding between "the leader of the American Democracy," James Buchanan, then United States Minister at the Court of St. James, and the leaders of the European democracy, by a *soirée* given in honor of the ambassador, who was soon to become President. This *soirée* was a curious gathering: near the hostess, at the table, sat Buchanan, near him Kossuth, and opposite them Ledru-Rollin and Mazzini; elsewhere Herten, Orsini, Garibaldi, Pulszky, Sickles and his wife, the host, and others of less fame or notoriety.

The style of the author in the original Hungarian, which we have before us, is not free from Germanisms; the numerous misspellings, chiefly of American names—some of them as bad as "Delavare," "Sparcks," and even "Jona" (for Iowa)—we are loath to ascribe to slips of a memory of the once famous retentiveness of which these very volumes still afford ample evidence.

The Graphic Arts: A Treatise on the Varieties of Drawing, Painting, and Engraving in comparison with each other and with Nature. By Philip Gilbert Hamerton. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1882.

IN the two representative arts, painting and sculpture, there are many varieties of artistic aim, and a great variety of processes, but, correctly speaking, there is but one art in each. Painting is the art of representing the forms and colors of things on flat surfaces, and sculpture is the art of producing forms in solid substance. The employment of different materials in painting—as water-color on wet plaster, water-color on paper, oil-color on canvas, etc.—or the employment of different materials, or of different methods in drawing (which is only a part of painting), does not constitute so many different and separate arts: these various methods and the use of various materials are simply different processes of one art. The varieties of purpose in drawing, even, to which the various processes lend themselves—as the securing of simple proportion in line, of finished contours, or of outline and solid form—do not make so many distinct arts of drawing. All possible varieties of aim and of process in drawing do but concern themselves with the elements of form. Good drawing, according to the conditions of material and purpose the normal conventions of which an accomplished draughtsman instinctively feels and obeys, is the one quality with which a draughtsman should be concerned. If a man can draw, all the minor technical matters pertaining to the different materials and aims will take sufficient care of themselves.

Mr. Hamerton, in the book before us, makes, we think, rather too much account of these minor matters. He does not take a sufficiently comprehensive view, nor consider enough the subject of graphic art in general, to convey an entirely right conception of the normal characteristics of design in the various processes of painting, drawing, and engraving. This ten-

dency to overlook the primarily important qualities of art, and to give undue prominence to mere processes, is characteristic of all Mr. Hamerton's work. It was so in the otherwise delightful book, 'The Painter's Camp'; it was markedly so in his 'Etching and Etchers'; and it is so again in the present book. In consequence of this tendency, he is not so good a guide to students of art as he might otherwise be. He is not discriminating enough in regard to what is essential. This is shown not only by his writing, but also by the illustrations to his books. The work on 'Etching and Etchers' hardly contains a single example of exemplary delineation considered as such. The illustrations to his 'Life of Turner' possess none of the fine characteristics of Turner's drawing; and the illustrations to the English edition of his present book are very ill-chosen from this point of view. Nevertheless, what Mr. Hamerton says of the various graphic processes contains a great deal that is highly interesting and instructive, though the interest and activity which it is calculated to excite will be out of all proportion to the use which most students of art are just now qualified to make of these processes.

In an early part of the book Mr. Hamerton reiterates the doctrine, which he has for some time held and taught—enunciating it most distinctly and fully in his 'Life of Turner'—that the business of an artist is to give aesthetic pleasure without necessary regard for truth to nature. He teaches that an artist may utterly violate all laws of truth with impunity. We hold this to be a very mistaken view of the matter. We agree with the proposition that it is an artist's business to give aesthetic pleasure; and we go so far, also, as to hold that if he does not give aesthetic pleasure, a man is not entitled to rank as an artist at all. But we entirely dissent from the doctrine that any aesthetic pleasure which does violence to nature can be worthy pleasure, or that any form of representative art which is not truthful can be good art. The limitations, or conventions, to which all art is more or less subject, are by no means of the nature of untruths. Against the idea that art should concern itself simply with physical facts Mr. Hamerton has very justly contended; but we think he has been led too far, and that his present doctrine is calculated to cut the arts adrift from their proper moorings quite as effectually as ever the narrowest pre-Raphaelite doctrines did. He says: "Poetic art is strangely independent both of science and of veracity" ('Life of Turner,' p. 319). In contrast to this, we may quote an admirable passage from the introduction to the 'History of Greek and Roman Sculpture' reviewed above. Mr. Perry says:

"There can be nothing arbitrary or irregular in true art. It can only affect us, it can only do its work, so long as it remains in alliance with nature and acts in strict conformity with her laws. But the artist is by no means limited to a mere reproduction of what he sees around him. Working on the lines which external nature has laid down, he transcends her bounds and passes into the ideal; he becomes, as it were, a creator, and his work is a new creature, not exactly corresponding to anything in external nature, yet not unnatural."

In the course of the work, Mr. Hamerton says many good things. Thus, speaking of the value of drawing in education (p. 47):

"Practical art has one distinct advantage over all purely intellectual pursuits, which is, that it does not educate the mind only, but also the eye and the hand. I am well aware that a foolish prejudice, which, if it is dying out, is dying too slowly, considers this training of eye and hand a mark of degradation, because the skilful use of these physical organs assimilates the artist to the artisan. Some people—but not the wisest—are as proud of having idle and useless hands as Chinese ladies are of their useless feet. With these all reasoning would be a waste of time,

but to others who have no such prejudice I may offer a few remarks in favor of this ocular and manual education. Let it not be supposed that the education which we gain from the graphic arts is by any means limited in its effects to the actual practice of those arts themselves. The eye which is trained by drawing discerns form everywhere and in everything; the hand which is skilled to use pencil or brush will be generally superior in delicacy and accuracy of touch to the hand which has never been taught. The question, therefore, is not simply whether we care to be skilful in drawing, but whether we prefer a keen eye to a comparatively blind one, and a ready hand to a clumsy one."

On pages 333 and 334 are some good remarks on what the author calls the over-ripeness of some forms of modern art. He says:

"The over-ripeness of art is indicated by the excessive predominance of fragmentary appearances in the mind of the artist, when a glance of light upon a leaf or a twig and a bit of broken dark shadow seem to him more important than the growth of the tree; when the sparkle of a jewel attracts his attention more than the shape of the arm that wears it; when the texture of a cow's horns and that of the hair between them is the subject of greater painstaking than the arrangement of a group of cattle. Finally, this over-ripeness leads to a kind of dexterous sketching, generally done with the palette-knife, which jumps from sparkle to sparkle, from spot to spot of shadow, like a wren in a hedge, without caring in the least about modelling a form, or about painting anything steadily and seriously with the brush. The French Salon of 1881 abounded in work of this flickering kind, and it appears to be the final development of French painting. There are still, of course, many exceptions—men like Landelle and Bouguereau, who do not allow themselves to be disturbed by the prevailing fashion; but Landelle is considered out of date by the new school, and Bouguereau a Philistine who paints for grocers. They are both a little primitive in paying more attention to line and less to texture than the best men of the present, but then they really do draw and paint; they use the brush, and can follow a line or model a limb, which, if the present tendency works to its ultimate results, nobody will be able to do in the next generation. In landscape this tendency may be less offensive, but even here it is unpleasant to see that plastering with the palette-knife has replaced fair painting with the brush."

Montesquieu's *Considerations on the Causes of the Grandeur and Decadence of the Romans*.

A new translation, together with an introduction, critical and illustrative notes, and an analytical index. By Jehu Baker. Being incidentally a rational discussion of the phenomena and tendencies of history in general. 12mo, pp. 526. D. Appleton & Co. 1882.

MR. BAKER has made a mistake in translating the title of Montesquieu's book. The French *Grandeur* is not "Grandeur" but "Greatness," and although this is a matter of slight importance in the title, the error is repeated on p. 182 with a real loss of sense. Montesquieu, in this important chapter (Chap. IX.), undertakes to point out "two causes of the ruin of Rome," and these two are given in the translation as "the grandeur of empire" and "the grandeur of the city." But this conveys a total misconception of the argument. It is the *extent* of the empire, and the *size* of the city, to which the inherited institutions of the Romans were no longer adequate, that are discussed in this chapter. The civic institutions of Rome were not equal to the government of a great empire: only the principle of representation could have remedied this defect. Further, even these civic institutions broke down in their immediate exercise in the city itself, because the governing body was no longer a manageable, homogeneous body, but a great mob of varying elements.

In general Mr. Baker's translation is not only correct, but remarkably free from idiotisms. It is hard to see any difference in style between his translation and his original work, which makes up nearly half the volume. The author shows moreover a good, accurate knowledge of the his-

tory and antiquities of Rome, so that we are really puzzled by two or three expressions which are hard to reconcile with his usually accurate scholarship. "A troop of seditious persons were called by the name of *comices*" (p. 184). What are "*comices*"? The word is neither Latin nor English, but the French for *comitia* (elective assembly). Again (p. 198), we twice have mention of "the law *curiate*." This, too, wholly unmeaning here, is a French word lugged into English; the *lex curiata de imperio* is meant. It might be called "*curiate law*," but certainly not "*law curiate*," as if *curiate* were a proper name. A similar blunder is "*Conjuratone de Catiline*" (p. 209), a phrase which is neither English, French, Latin, nor Italian. Montesquieu wrote *Conjuration*, and his phrase, instead of being translated, is copied with an error added. On p. 169, *Caritium* stands as *certium*; and on p. 208 *Sulpicius* as *Sulpitius*—Montesquieu's own mistake. These would be serious faults if they were characteristic of the book; as it is, they are blemishes upon a really good work—the author evidently nodded at these points.

Montesquieu's observations upon Roman history have so far become a commonplace of historical science, that it is difficult to judge them fairly in the light of the more advanced knowledge of the present day. But in general it may be said that the points in which most change has been made by Niebuhr and his successors are such as to make very little difference with Montesquieu's discussions. He speaks of the power of the state as exercised by its lawful heads; while the structure of the government, the details of the Constitution, the internal history even, hardly concern him in treating of the establishment of the imperial dominion of Rome. Again, when he comes to speak of internal relations—for example, in the contests of plebeians and patricians, and in the decay and overthrow of the Republic—he confines himself for the most part to large political causes, and pays little attention to social causes. Here is the defect in the ninth chapter and those which go with it. The two causes of ruin mentioned above are purely political; an even more powerful cause, the most fundamental of all, he hardly touches upon, and even Mr. Baker passes it over in equal silence—the collapse of free society. Free institutions fell because free society had dissolved, and the cause of this was slavery. Free society cannot exist without free industry, and free labor can no more exist side by side with slave labor than good money can circulate along with bad money. *Latifundia perdidit Italiam*, not, as Pliny supposed, because they were large estates, but because they were given over to slave labor. The freeholds of the Italian peasantry were absorbed in great plantations, and the peasants themselves either rushed to Rome to swell the number of the proletariat there, leaving their places to be taken by slaves, or were themselves converted into serfs. This most important revolution is hardly noticed by either Montesquieu or his translator.

If the earlier chapters of Montesquieu's work hardly miss the results of the investigations of the nineteenth century, this want is felt more seriously in the closing chapters, upon the fall of the Empire. His observations are good so far as they go, but his point of view was very incomplete. The relation of the barbarians to the Empire is far better understood now than at that time: here, therefore, his political style of treatment fails to find a complete solution for the problem. M. Fustel de Coulanges's 'Institutions,' if somewhat one-sided, and itself incomplete, affords, nevertheless, just what earlier writers were not in a condition to give, and is by far the best single account of this great revolution. In conclusion, we will say again that Mr.

Baker has done very well the task which he proposed to himself, but that it was somewhat more narrow than we should have desired. His author's work should have been supplemented. Adopting in the main that author's point of view, he has added much material, all of which is good, and much of it excellent, without on the whole bringing Montesquieu's analysis up to the standard of present scholarship.

Myth and Science. Tito Vignoli. [International Scientific Series.] D. Appleton & Co. 1882. Pp. 327.

MYTH, according to the peculiar sense in which it is used in this volume, begins in animism, and culminates in the "entification of sensations and ideas." A number of facts are collected to show that animals are animistic, differing, however, from man only in the fact that, with the former, the illusions do not outlast the sensations, while in the latter they occasion fetishes, which are gradually organized into mythologies and theologies, only to be subtilized into more subjective myths, called ideas, will, etc., in systems like those of Hegel and Schopenhauer. Not only do we speak of "wild ground," "a threatening sky," "the thirsty earth," the "foot of a mountain," "the arm of the sea," a "conflict of ideas," but speech, music, weight, color, love, number, and even equality, identity, etc., are either incarnated, personified, or, in a word, entitled by a spontaneous instinct psychologically identical with that by which a child grasps at a soft or flexible thing, as if it were solid, or rigid, or at a sunbeam as if it were palpable. A number of curious hypnotic illusions to which the author is subject are given to show that dreams also are included under his law of the entification of images, as is also the artistic faculty. Although the function of science is the dissolution of myth, the former will long continue to be the unconscious victim of illusion, so far as the entification of its fundamental ideas is concerned.

The great fault of this book is its size. The author writes in a prolix and cumbrous style, exceedingly like that of Comte; pays ceremonious respects to many writers, especially to Herbert Spencer, the "modern Aristotle"; quotes himself for eighteen pages at a time; repeats facts by the score from Tylor and Gubernatis; and takes up much space with resums of what he has done, and with plans for future chapters. In one-third the room the matter would have seemed more valuable.

The Old Regime—Court, Salons, and Theatres. By Catherine Charlotte, Lady Jackson. Henry Holt & Co. 1882. Pp. 546.

THE reign of Louis XV., like that of Charles II. of England, is infamous for debauchery in society and ignominy in public affairs. A picture of such a court is not a pleasant subject to contemplate, and one is ready to ask, To what purpose rake in these records of shame and preserve the memory of what had best be forgotten? When we remember, on the other hand, that the age of Louis XV. was also that of three men who exercised a wonderful influence upon the human mind—Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot—

we must admit that it is worth while to acquaint ourselves with the society in which these men played a part. The sketch of this society given by Lady Jackson is vivid and entertaining, and—for so foul a period—unobjectionable in tone. There is another point of view in which we may recognize a high value in the book. Louis XV. is called (p. 520) "this worthless king"; and no doubt there is no king in history whom this epithet better describes. But somehow it is impossible to turn over these pages without a certain sympathy for this worthless creature, and a recognition of the pathos in his fate. He was a beautiful child, a remarkably handsome man; and he reached the age of twenty-four without reproach. Not kingly, he had no liking for the cares of state—he was fond of gardening and of hunting, and showed absolutely no inclination for the vices which surrounded him. He was, so to speak, forced into vice, deliberately and of set purpose. Once corrupted, he plunged deeper and deeper into the mire of debauchery, until he became the wreck that we all know. He would have been an estimable country gentleman; if let alone, he would have been a tolerable king; it was his fate to be the victim of the reaction from the sanctimonious hypocrisy of his predecessor's court, while his peaceful tastes and the loss of prestige of his reign served as a contrast to the splendid and unscrupulous ambition of Louis XIV.

Charlemagne. By the Rev. Edward L. Cutts, B.A. [Home Library.] With map. London. 12mo, pp. 345.

THE Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge is doing very good work in the series of handy volumes upon various subjects published under its auspices. The "Home Library" forms one of these series. Mr. Cutts's 'Charlemagne' is not so much a life of Charlemagne as a history of the Frank nation and empire, with the great Emperor as its chief feature. Less than half the book is devoted to him; the first half of the volume describes the fortunes of the Franks from their first appearance in history down to the time of Charlemagne. It is written in a pleasant style, and appears to be the result of conscientious preparation. The relation of Church and State at this important epoch is handled with very fair spirit. The least satisfactory part of the book is that which treats of constitutional matters—we should rather say which does not treat of them, for they are entirely neglected. It would be a mistake, in a book designed for general readers, to enter into such points with any fulness; still, these formed so important a portion of the activity of Charles the Great, and they are so essential to any understanding of the times, that they ought to have received some attention. St. Columbanus is said (p. 513) to have been born in 543, and to have crossed over to Gaul in 585, at the age of thirty—not a very exact bit of calculating. On page 163 Carinthia is spelt Corinthia.

Stories from the State Papers. By Alexander Charles Ewald, F. S. A. [of the Record Office.] Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1882. 8vo, pp. 360.

MR. EWALD'S interesting volume is for the most

part confined to the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, none of the stories belonging to a later period, and only one to an earlier one. The first paper, "The Youth of Henry the Fifth," shows, from the evidence of contemporary documents, that there is no foundation for the tradition as to this king's youth with which we are all familiar from Shakspeare; that, on the other hand, he was trusted and employed by his father in important concerns. It is noted incidentally that the wish ascribed to Henry IV., that some fairy had exchanged Prince Henry for the infant son of the Earl of Northumberland in their cradles—"then would I have his Harry and he mine"—is a ludicrously impossible one, Hotspur being only six months younger than Bolingbroke himself.

The stories here related are fifteen in number, ranging from so familiar a subject as "The Invincible Armada" to "The Sweating Sickness" and "The Lancashire Witches." In "A Perished Kernel" we are interested to find the case of the Earl of Somerset and Sir Thomas Overbury related—which has recently been treated by Mr. Spedding in his (and Mr. Gairdner's) 'Studies in English History' (see the *Nation*, April 27). Mr. Ewald holds the common view that Somerset knew some discreditable secret about King James, which he threatened to divulge. He does not, however, answer, or even notice, the arguments, which appear to us conclusive, that Mr. Spedding brings up in favor of the King. His suggestion that "the King had given instructions, independently of and unknown to Lady Somerset, to make an end of Overbury," seems to us puerile. And when he proceeds to pronounce such a crime not unlikely on the part of James I., he runs counter to the judgment of the best-informed students of this period, which is, on the whole, more favorable to the ability and character of James than that of former historians.

As a companion to English history, this book will be welcomed; especially as illustrating by striking and lucid examples the degree in which fresh light has been thrown upon old subjects by the exploration of the state papers.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Appletons' Hand-book of Summer Resorts. D. Appleton & Co. 50 cents.
Baker, C. Alice. A Summer in the Azores. Boston: Lee & Shepard. \$1.25.
Bastian, A. Der Buddhismus in seiner Psychologie. Berlin.
Burnham, Clara Louise. A Sane Lunatic. Chicago: Henry A. Sumner & Co. \$1.
Hamilton, F. H. Health Aphorisms. Birmingham & Co.
Hunt, Sara K. The Deeds Birthday-Book. Funk & Wagnall. \$1.
Ingersoll's Interviews on Talmage. Washington, D. C.: C. P. Farrell.
King, J. W. The War Ships and Navies of the World. New ed. Boston: A. Williams & Co.
Marjory: a Study. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
Mothers' Record. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. \$1.
Oliphant, Mrs. Literary History of England, XVIIIth and XIXth Century. 3 vols. Macmillan & Co.
Richardson, J. G. Long Life, and How to Reach It. Philadelphia: P. Blakiston, Son & Co. 30 cents.
Scott, L. Ghiberti and Donatello, with Other Italian Sculptors. Scribner & Welford. \$1.
Stretton, Henba. The Lord's Pursebearers. Boston: D. Lothrop & Co. \$1.25.
Studley, Mary J. What Our Girls Ought to Know. Funk & Wagnall. \$1.
Trinity. The: A Nineteenth-Century Passion-Play. Cambridge: F. Johnson.
Two Days. Fords, Howard & Hulbert. 60 cents.
Wonderful Fan. By Aunt Ella. E. P. Dutton & Co. 50 cents.
Wright, C. D. The Relation of Political Economy to the Labor Question. Boston: A. Williams & Co.

Summer Reading.

WILLIAM PENN. By Robert J. Burdette, of the Burlington Hawkeye. 16mo (Lives of American Worthies), \$1.25.
YESTERDAY. An American Novel. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

SERJEANT BALLANTINE'S
Some Experiences of a Barrister's Life.
Large 12mo, with portrait, \$2.50.

THE OLD REGIME. By Lady Jackson. 12mo (uniform with 'Old Paris'), \$2.25.

HEAPS OF MONEY. By W. E. Norris, author of 'Matrimony.' 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

THE REVOLT OF MAN. A Satirical Novel. 16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

HENRY HOLT & CO., New York.

